

THE
SATURDAY REVIEW

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 2,946 Vol. 114.

13 April 1912.

[REGISTERED AS A] 6d.
NEWSPAPER.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
NOTES OF THE WEEK.	445	SPECIAL ARTICLE:		CORRESPONDENCE (continued):	
LEADING ARTICLES:		Divinity at Oxford and Cambridge:		Hexameters of the Authorised Version.	
The Home Rule Bill.	448	I. The "Nationalisation" of Oxford		By G. M. Marston, and others	462
The Ulster Bar.	449	Divinity. By Douglas Maclean.	458	Applause at Concerts. By D. L.	
Coal—Retrospect and Prospect.	450	II. The Decadence of Cambridge		Forbes	462
Libel and Trade Union Immunity	451	Theology. By Archdeacon Cuning-		"Badajoz 1812." By Major Morris	
The Turks and the Powers	452	ningham	459	Bent	462
THE CITY	453	VERSE:		A Copious Fountain of Honour. By	
MIDDLE ARTICLES:		Ulster	454	the Hon. Stephen Coleridge	462
Tchekoff in London. By John Palmer	453	CORRESPONDENCE:		Germany and the Monroe Doctrine.	
The New Far-Eastern Rooms in the		Criminal Procedure To-day. By W. P.		By H. Lechmere Clift	463
Louvre. By Royall Tyler	455	Fullagar and G. H. Sutherland	460	REVIEWS:	
The Jena Symphony. By John F.		The Commons' Shilling Dinner	461	The Irish Policy of Mr. Gladstone	463
Runciman	456	The Key to Polonius' Wisdom. By		Court Life at Peking	464
A House in Anglesea. By Filson		Thomas H. Brentnall	461	Home Rule Ex Parte	465
Young	457	French and English Laughter. By		Profane Fingers on Sacred Pictures	465
		John Palmer	461	An Egoist—with Apologies etc.	466
		Angels in Sculpture. By Sir William		SHORTER NOTICES	467
		Eden, Bart.	461	THE APRIL REVIEWS	467

We beg to state that we decline to return or to enter into correspondence as to rejected communications; and to this rule we can make no exception. Manuscripts not acknowledged within four weeks are rejected.

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

Home Rule has knit all loyalists together. "We have proved we have hearts in a cause, we are noble still". It has sometimes seemed very different in days of Conservative depression. At a political dinner years ago a brilliant young Tory, after listening in silence to gloomy prophecies as to what Radicalism would do ere long, turned and remarked "I don't think it much matters what they do if they leave us our stuff". That cynic is now a middle-aged Radical himself, and we suppose he has complacently given up even his one proviso. To let everything "go to the Dickens" and not bother too much about it, seems since then to have grown into gospel among too many people with anything to lose, the gospel of indifference. The "proud keep of Windsor" was given up on a scare, and who could be very sure that the Castle itself might not be voted away if Mr. Redmond or Mr. Keir Hardie so willed it? Our liberties have largely gone, our Church and land are following suit; whilst the franchise, once the treasure of the educated few, is to be a worthless toy for muddle-headed millions. It has really appeared of late as if in England nothing is worth saving, or at least fighting for.

In this quite rotten state of things the splendid manhood of Ulster is an immense boon. Whatever comes out of this Home Rule move, Mr. Asquith has without intention done the national character a service by selling his soul to Patrick Ford and the whole crew of Irish disloyalists, for the result of the bargain is the light that has leapt up in the North of Ireland. Even the most timid can warm themselves before that fire, and get back something of the old English spirit. Far and away the biggest thing about the Home Rule business to-day is the action of Ulster. There was nothing at

all equal to it in 1886, still less in 1893. What the Commons do with the Bill, and what the Lords do, is a far less fateful thing than the way Ulster has made up its mind; this would still be quite true if by some chance the Commons threw out the Bill. It was because he fully recognised the meaning of the Ulster movement that Mr. Bonar Law spoke the most striking words at Belfast—"If we defeat Home Rule now, we defeat it for ever."

Defeating Home Rule we shall defeat quite a host of plots to rob or ruin the country. Ulster has thus come to the aid of England and the Empire at least as usefully as England to Ulster's aid. It is in this spirit of resolution, even of thankfulness, that the whole Unionist party has entered on the struggle. It is not going to fight with "pared nails", and its keenness and compactness has never been perhaps more marked than it was at the opening of the House of Commons side of the business on Thursday. There is this great difference between now and 1893: then it was not really felt to be a fight for life. By comparison it was fencing twenty years ago, where now it must be closing at death-grips.

But we may hope the Leaders will not use their nails against each other too tearfully with the Bill yet in its courtesy stage—for, if they act so on Second Reading, what may not happen in Committee? It is dangerous when the Leader of the House sandwiches between his oration and his peroration a challenge to the Leader of the Opposition to a duel of naked truth telling; and doubly so when the man challenged is fond of coming out plump with things as they are and as all men know perfectly well they are. This is precisely what happened on Thursday. If any Liberal declares on his word of honour that the Government are trying to put through Home Rule simply because they love it, not because they live on it, why obviously that Liberal is a good party man; but if he believed it into the bargain we should be tempted to regard him as a gull. Nobody of course does believe it in the House where politicians are experts. Yet so powerful is habit, the habit of dressing up the truth, so that one cannot see its form, much less its flesh, that Mr. Bonar Law's "You haven't any convictions" was

the most startling personal truth since Mr. Chamberlain accused Sir William Harcourt across the table of being "not on talking terms" with Lord Rosebery his Leader.

Bitterly Mr. Asquith complained of the new bad style of his opponents. The truth having been shot out, we think all Unionists can be generous; and it may be said at once that Mr. Asquith's style, new or old, is beyond reproach. We have heard many scores of speeches from him, and have read hundreds, and cannot recall a single lapse in the old parliamentary form. In his constitution he is incapable of the offence parliamentary or personal. We believe, if a Unionist Mr. Ure were to spring up and outdo the Radical Mr. Ure, the Prime Minister's language would not even be "variegated" enough to dub the offender "frigid and calculated". Whether it is the Prime Minister's party duty to break the Constitution, or to break his pledge—for example his pledge as to House of Lords reform—or whether it is his party duty to bewray the Crown, it is all the same: he does it in faultless parliamentary form.

His speech introducing the Bill left little to be desired in form. If not an intellectual treat, as Gladstone's nearly always were on these occasions—and as Lord Rosebery's notably was in the House of Lords in the '93 debate—it was arranged with perfect clearness. In exposition—a curiously rare art in which clever men are often rank duffers—Mr. Asquith has had only one marked superior in recent years, Joseph Chamberlain. This art is popularly supposed to be the province of "plain men of business"; a delusion, it being a gift of intellect and well within the province of literature and style in literature, if anything in the world is. To leave clear on the mind of hearer and reader alike a very fair idea of a great complex scheme like this, and by a speech of under two hours, is a feat; for there is some ornament and argument to be pressed into service besides the large body of fact and figure. Save for the opening passage, Mr. Asquith was far less rotund than one has known him in many lesser speeches. The phrasing was not brilliant: the power of the speech as a whole is quite undeniable, but no sentence or saying in it will live.

Mr. Asquith allowed himself little or no by-play. There was one slightly humorous passage with the Irish Loyalist Leader. Sir Edward Carson is to be unseated in the English Parliament. But Mr. Asquith—as tender as Disraeli to Lowe—proposes to find him a seat in the Irish Parliament. It is a small sop, but Cerberus is not taking any.

Sir Edward Carson: "You don't expect me to be there!"

Mr. Asquith: "At any rate, the right hon. gentleman would have a chance."

There was a light passage, too, though not intended so, when Mr. Asquith sketched the Senate. It is to have forty members—a rather suggestive number, by the way, recalling a body of the same size in Ali Baba. To start with, they are to be nominated by the Imperial Executive, but as they retire by rotation their places are to be filled up by the Irish Executive instead. One likes, too, the idea of making the forty sit cheek by jowl with the 164 when a quarrel breaks out: that is a truly Irish way of settling an Irish difference.

As to finance, the Government thank Sir Henry Primrose "deeply" for the "able and exhaustive" report of his Committee, but have not been able to adopt it. They will go their own way, not the Primrose one, that leads to the everlasting bonfire. The popping-in-and-out clause—the clause which passes the wit of man according to Mr. Gladstone—Mr. Asquith left to the tail of his speech. That England may be free to work out her own destiny, and make her own laws as she wills, she is henceforth to have only forty-two Irish members to come to the House of Commons and obstruct her business when she will no longer have

power to touch theirs; forty-two members to come over whenever English parties are nicely balanced in the jaunting-car and then upset it.

That is, as all knew it must be, the master stroke of the Bill. We were talking a few weeks since with a leading Irish Nationalist about this wonderful arrangement. He admitted honestly that by interfering in foreign affairs and Estimates the Nationalists must remain a power at Westminster. "You have had things your way for centuries in the past", he put it; "it is only fair we should have it a bit our way henceforward". And he added with a flush of defiance, "Rather than give up this power over foreign affairs and money we would give up Home Rule!"

We recall quite distinctly the speech which Sir Edward Clarke made in reply to Mr. Gladstone's in 1893. It was the perfect debating effort. Point by point he answered Gladstone just as if he had read Gladstone's speech not overnight even but a week before and had analysed it long and closely. But we have not the faintest hesitation in saying that Sir Edward Carson's speech replying to the Prime Minister was ten times more moving and more convincing. Its absolute spontaneity, even in the reading, informs every line and sentence: that is of course one of the secrets of his power. He cannot be briefed—strange in a great advocate! Ulster no more briefed him than he briefed Ulster. Through this and a quite uncommon manner of speech, fiercely direct and yet not giving the idea altogether of unkindness, Sir Edward Carson is the most interesting personality in the House to-day. He is an original. His stuff does not come out of books or theories or debates, but out of himself. There is a rare virtue in that.

We have an old respect for Mr. John Redmond as orator, and for both him and his brother as men. We cannot forget that whilst most of their colleagues were on the run they stood firm for their strange, great chief twenty years ago. Besides they clearly are in conduct, and chance by birth to be, that unfashionable thing which, it is said, a member of the Carlton at the time of the split exclaimed he always knew Parnell was; that thing which only Mr. Bernard Shaw to-day, in his Syndicalist platform speeches, ventures to talk about. Mr. Redmond has a right to our respect, too, for the way in which he has drilled his awkward Liberal squad. But the ending of his speech really is a bit too much for any but a very stout stomach. The gravy in this feast was over rich and greasy. Nor can we reconcile ourselves to the "new style" of making of the Lord's Prayer a tag to round off your oration.

The picture, which he sketched and framed, of Parnell and Gladstone in bonds of loving brotherhood wringing each other's hands was a felt picture, we doubt not: Mr. Redmond has a real right to speak of Parnell. But we cannot help thinking it extremely unfortunate that on the day he exhibited this sentimental, even this religious picture, a too well-posted expert was suffered in the "Westminster Gazette" to show to the world quite another print. Well I remember pacing the corridor with a member of his own party who told me the story of how the Chief had revealed the coming disaster to one of his followers.

It snapped out suddenly in the middle of a talk on other subjects.

"By the way, I'm not going to defend that divorce suit."

"Good God! sir, it'll be the ruin of you" was the reply.

"Ruin be damned!" said Parnell; "it'll be a nine days' wonder, and that'll be the end of it."

What a drop from Mr. Redmond's heavenly ladder in the Commons to the fire-escape at Eltham!

Counting out was a method nicely adapted to the busybody meddling of Mr. Chiozza Money with such a vast subject as that on which he spread himself in the House of Commons on Wednesday. Lectures on

the scientific aspect of the coal supplies, and methods of utilising their motive power, may be heard with more or less respect from men of science. At second-hand they are superfluous. As for the economies—the State ownership of the coal-fields, and the creation and distribution of power from them; who is going to minister to Mr. Money's self-importance by discussing it on his motion? Mr. Robertson treated him as bores are treated when one must be polite to them. Conceited little men expatiating on big topics is, however, not quite a new spectacle in the House of Commons.

Mr. Harcourt gave the House this week some interesting information about the Imperial Trade Commission on Wednesday. No salaries will be paid to the Commissioners; the Dominions are to pay their own expenses, and India is excluded. Several questions were levelled at the absurdity of clause six, of which more will be heard. The Commissioners set out to discover how far trade within the Empire is "affected beneficially or otherwise by the laws now in force"; and they deliberately exclude fiscal laws from their consideration. Mr. Harcourt was unable to tell the House whether this absurd regulation would cover the Commissioners' inquiries as to the relations of Colonies amongst themselves as well as their relations with the Mother Country. His ignorance was scandalous, or feigned.

Mr. Keir Hardie is quite unable to understand the distinction between the man who goes on strike within the law, and the man who is in open riot outside the law. The Attorney-General and Colonel Seely have put it repeatedly in the simplest language; but Mr. Keir Hardie jumps up afresh every time, as soon as he hears the word "soldier", and shows that he is still in a hopeless muddle about it. This week he has jumped up with an amendment to the Army Annual Bill, basing it on the plea that no one would join the Army if he were told that it would be part of his duty to shoot down his comrades in a trade dispute; which, of course, it is not.

"Officers should regard the existing organisation of our Army as a permanency; they should teach the public to regard it in this manner." Thus saith Sir John French in the current "Army Review". But does he not see that this is telling officers to do just what in the next sentence he says they must not do—"trench upon ground reserved for the Government and Legislature"? Officers who take it upon them to teach the public that the Army will always be a voluntary one and that the Territorial Force will go on for ever are talking politics. They are simply playing advocate of Lord Haldane's policy. General French did not mean what he said we are sure; a true soldier, he is mightier with the sword than with the pen.

No movement to damage the Church of which he is an officer would be complete without the support of the Bishop of Hereford. So here we have him writing against Liberal Churchmen who have the conscience and the courage to prefer their Church to their party. To Dr. Perceval such a course is inconceivable; so he is very indignant with these "seceders". Let a man secede from the Church, the Bishop of Hereford would take it quietly enough; but to secede from the Liberal Party, that is a serious matter. This Bishop's long course of treachery to his Church is really something of a scandal; but his influence in the Church is nil, so nobody troubles much about it or him.

His letter is nothing but the stalest Liberation Society points badly put. Here is one: when the endowments now to be taken away were given to the Church, the Church represented the whole community; therefore the whole community ought to have them. As it happens, these endowments were never given to the Church but to particular churches; and if they were given to the whole community in any sense, which they were not, it was when the whole community was

Christian and catholic. This is not now; so by the Bishop's own argument, it has no right to these endowments. The one certain thing about these gifts is that the donors meant them for purely religious and Christian purposes: they were given to God. Disestablishers would divert them to Cæsar.

That most loquacious of trade unions, the National Union of Teachers, has actually done something sensible. At its conference at Hull (it is always in conference and speech-making somewhere) it refused by a majority of over thirteen thousand even to discuss woman suffrage. So these people do sometimes mind their own business.

Commenting on a remark of the president of the N.U.T., which one need not trouble about, the "Westminster Gazette" says that denominationalists' appeal to parents is a mere afterthought to cloak the facts. This is hardly decent in a party that is afraid to face the facts. If parents do not desire denominational teaching, the plan Churchmen approve will show it. We are keen to bring out the facts; Liberals insist on their being cloaked. Why? Simply because they are afraid that the appeal to the parent, like a religious census, would make the Church look well in comparison with Nonconformity.

Mr. Hyndman arrived late at a socialist meeting held in the Free Trade Hall, Manchester, on Sunday evening last. Consequently he did not hear what the chairman had said about syndicalism. The result was disastrous; for the chairman had told the audience that he had the utmost respect for syndicalism, and there "need not be the slightest antagonism between socialism and syndicalism". Now the logical distinction is obvious. Syndicalist miners want to take the mines from coal-owners, and to keep them; Socialist miners want to take the mines from coal-owners, and to hand them over to the State. The distinction between them is as obvious as is their point of contact. They are perfectly agreed upon the first necessary step. They both want to take the mines from coal-owners.

Mr. Hyndman, arriving after the chairman had sat down, calmly proceeded, as a good socialist, to tell the meeting that no one but a madman could be a syndicalist. "If syndicalism", he said, "meant that each trade was to take hold of its own industry, and use it for its own purpose, it was a reactionary step, and he did not believe that that idea was held by more than a mere insignificant minority of the people of this country. Outside Tom Mann he never met more than one sane man who believed in it, and that was in a 'loony' interval".

The coal strike was officially declared at an end last Saturday. The men's delegates met the executive of the Miners' Federation, and quickly decided (the meeting did not last more than two hours) that they would accept the leaders' recommendation to go back to work. Technically, of course, the strike ended with the failure of the extremists to obtain a two-thirds majority against resumption. But the decisive vote of the whole Federation for peace is none the less important. Had the official decision been given in the opposite sense, the inevitable return of the minority to work would have resulted in serious trouble between strikers and non-strikers in districts where opinion was divided. The Federation's decision puts every striker in the wrong who interferes with trade unionists returning to work.

Happily the trouble is at an end in Lancashire, where Mr. Greenall, President of the Lancashire and Cheshire Federation, persuaded the men to reject his leaders' decision. Mr. Greenall held to the view, which has already done the miners' cause much mischief, that the men should not return to work till the schedules were fixed. The followers of Mr. Greenall

attempted to coerce their neighbours into leaving the pits, and came into violent collision with the police. On Wednesday the position was so serious that troops were moved into the district. These events in Lancashire show the mischief which would certainly have followed everywhere an official decision to continue the strike. However, the Lancashire miners are now all at work.

The latest trade union case is, from a personal point of view, interesting, because it brings Lord Justice Farwell into prominence again. As Mr. Justice Farwell he was the first to decide in 1901, in the Taff Vale Railway case, that a trade union could be sued in its registered name, though it was not a corporation, nor an individual, nor a partnership, and no statute made it so suable.

In the Court of Appeal his decision was reversed; but the House of Lords restored it. Three or four years afterwards, in 1906, the Trade Disputes Act made trade unions non-suable. Now Lord Justice Farwell is in the Appeal Court himself, and he dissents from his brethren Vaughan Williams and Kennedy—who were not the Lords Justices, however, in the Taff Vale Railway case—on the construction of the Act. Very rarely does a Judge influence great events as Lord Justice Farwell has done. His decision in the Vacher case cuts down the scope of the 1906 Act; and he is thus true to his tradition. But the other Judges give trade unions so much that it might be safer for them if Lord Justice Farwell is once more upheld in the House of Lords.

Constant growth has marked the Public Trustee's Department since its creation five years ago, and as the fourth report says, this shows it has ministered to a public need. Its current business is now twenty-four millions; and more significant are the intending testators who are going to appoint the Public Trustee. They represent a calculated sum of forty-four millions. The Trustee finds himself with eleven thousand pounds surplus after four years, and the fees are to be reduced, though they are quite moderate. One attractive feature is that his investments in strict trustee stock make nearly four per cent., and in non-trustee stocks four and a fifth. This must tend to encourage testators to put their estates into his hands; and, in fact, it is the large estates where testators and beneficiaries know most that are increasing proportionately to others in the department. Safety and good returns make irresistible appeal.

The recent death of Bodley's Librarian will recall to many besides Oxford men the familiar figure, sitting in the centre of the long gallery that lies between the "Sheldonian" and the "Camera", a kindly spider in the middle of the web of scholarship, facing the vista of Duke Humphrey's library. Every student of the last quarter of a century, who has sat at his work in the side-chapels off that aisle, with the quiet green of Exeter garden beyond the ancient panes, will easily summon a picture of Mr. Nicholson to his mind. Amongst a studious rustling of the leaves of manuscripts, books, and catalogues of books, and the soft rapid passage of attendants summoned by constant bells, there radiated from his desk the spirit of active librarianship.

The vacant post is advertised in the "Oxford University Gazette", and the machinery of appointment, doubtless hampered by the temporary absence of many electors, is nevertheless in motion. The name that occurs most readily in this connexion is that of Mr. Falconer Madan, who for many years has been the second in command of the Bodleian. His magnum opus in the bibliographical line is the Catalogue of the Bodleian manuscripts, a collection excelled only by those in the Vatican, the Bibliothèque Nationale, and the British Museum. But nowadays no librarian can afford to be only a compiler of catalogues, and Mr. Madan's other qualifications, including a ready courtesy to puzzled but grateful readers, entitle him to special consideration for that honourable chair.

THE HOME RULE BILL.

BETWEEN Mr. Asquith's statement on Thursday and that of Mr. Gladstone when he introduced his first Home Rule Bill twenty-six years ago, there was a strange contrast which must have been present to the mind of the small group of members who were in their places on both occasions. "Few", says Lord Morley in his vivid account of the scene of 8 April 1886, "are the heroic moments in our parliamentary politics, but this was one." And of the chief actor he writes: "Political oratory is action not words—action, character, will, conviction, purpose, personality". How far Mr. Gladstone at this crisis really deserved the eulogy of his biographer may be questioned. But undoubtedly there was something of the "heroic" about the earlier Home Rule episode and its protagonist which is conspicuously wanting to the latest. Mr. Asquith spoke with his accustomed command of stately diction and fluent argumentative exposition; but there is no impress of "character, will, conviction" in the present attitude of the Liberal party and its leader. The third Home Rule Bill is a frank piece of political opportunism, an ingenious attempt to liquidate the Ministerial debt to the Nationalist members without casting too heavy a strain upon the conscience of English Liberalism. The lambent flame of passion which played round Mr. Gladstone, as he worked himself up to his Separatist enterprise, has smouldered to its ashes. It blazes fiercely enough among the Ulstermen; but English Liberals will regard Mr. Asquith's scheme at the best with cold and grudging acquiescence.

There will be time enough to discuss its details later. At the first view, what strikes one is the kind of perverted ingenuity with which it has been framed. It is an attempt to achieve the impossible—to make Ireland at once a "colony" and a province, to give a colourable excuse both to those who look for federation and to those who aspire to independence. The result is that this Bill embodies the chief vices of its two Gladstonian predecessors, with added defects and crudities of its own. It is a masterpiece of fantastic complication, in some important respects more objectionable on political and constitutional grounds and more unjust to the British taxpayer than either of the former schemes. In the proposal to establish an Irish Parliament, with a nominated Senate of forty members and an elective Chamber of 164, Mr. Asquith has followed neither the Bill of 1886 nor that of 1893. He has discarded Mr. Gladstone's two legislative "orders"—the first consisting of twenty-eight representative peers and seventy-five elected members, the second of 103 existing Irish members of the House of Commons, with 101 others added. In 1893 Mr. Gladstone suggested a Legislative Council of forty-eight elected members and a Legislative Assembly of 103 members. Mr. Asquith has abandoned the principle of election in the Upper House, and has increased the number of members of the Lower House by more than a half. The nominative character of the Senate is supposed to be a slight set-off to the complete swamping of the minority in the Irish House of Commons. The new arrangement would give Ulster only fifty-nine members out of a total of 164, and those fifty-nine would, of course, include a considerable number of Nationalists. The Irish members are to be retained at Westminster for all purposes. In the 1886 Bill they were to be excluded; in 1893 the fantastic "in-and-out" clause was excluded, and it was decided to retain Irish representation with diminished numbers. Mr. Asquith would now cut it down to forty-two, which would be at the rate of one member for every hundred thousand of the population. Supposing the existing balance of parties to be permanent, there would then be thirty-four Nationalists at Westminster and eight Irish Unionists. The Nationalist "bloc" would still be a formidable factor in such a parliamentary situation as the present. Supreme in Ireland, they would still possess power to harass English interests and disturb the stability of the English party system, in order to evade the restrictions and escape the liabilities imposed by the new Constitution.

The retention of the Irish members at Westminster is intended to emphasise that supremacy of the Imperial Parliament which is one of Mr. Asquith's guarantees against the abuse of their powers by the new Legislature and Executive. Like most of the other safeguards in the Act it is largely illusory. Of course, the Imperial Parliament will have a technical title to reverse Irish Acts and control the Irish Government. It has never formally abandoned that prerogative in a self-governing colony; but we all know what the right is worth in practice. In Ireland it would either be operative or allowed to lapse. In the former case we shall get back to the condition which prevailed under Poynings' Act, and self-government would become a mere irritating fiction. That is not the idea of any Irish Nationalist; and Mr. Redmond, in the course of Thursday's debate, significantly pointed out that Ireland could not object to that superiority of the Imperial Parliament which was acknowledged by every self-governing colony. This seems to mean that in the opinion of the Nationalist leader the Imperial Parliament will have no more control over Irish administration than it has over that of the Dominion of Canada and the Commonwealth of Australia. So Ireland will get "Colonial Home Rule" after all, which is precisely what Mr. Asquith disclaims. His Bill includes a whole catalogue of "reserved powers", but it is not at all clear how the reservation is to be made effective if the Irish Executive declines to respect it. The veto of the Lord Lieutenant, exercised on the advice of the Irish Cabinet, is, of course, no check at all; nor is the nominated Senate, since the nominations are to be made eventually by the same body. There is the appeal to the Judicial Committee against any "unconstitutional" proceeding; but an Executive can go very far without technically infringing the terms of the organic statute, especially when it has power to levy taxation, and to control education. Nor do we see how the Irish Government is to be restrained from carrying out its policy, even after this has been condemned by the highest judicial tribunal, except by the forcible action of the Imperial Government. We should not envy the position of a Prime Minister (of the United Kingdom) who might have to choose between allowing the law to be flagrantly defied by a Dublin Cabinet and enforcing it by revolutionary methods. In the last resort no doubt it would always be possible to reduce an Irish Government to obedience; but the process would be so inconvenient that we may be quite sure it would not be adopted save under pressure of the most urgent necessity. Reserve powers, as we discovered in the case of the Transvaal suzerainty, are seldom exercised over a subordinate State until they have been dangerously violated.

In Ireland the temptation to go beyond the restrictions laid down by the Bill would be considerable. The financial provisions seem carefully arranged for that purpose. They are exceedingly unjust to England, since the British taxpayer will be making a free gift of something like two millions a year to Ireland, without receiving from that country any fair contribution to the National Debt or to the Imperial services. But this will not content Irishmen, who will not unnaturally consider the Imperial collection of all local revenue other than duties and the Joint Exchequer Board a slur upon that "nationhood" which the new legislation is supposed to recognise. In a few years Ireland will probably discover that she is again suffering under the gravest financial grievances, notwithstanding the fact that she is drawing more from the Imperial Treasury than she pays in; and the whole nation, headed by its Executive, and actively supported by its delegation at Westminster, might cheerfully embark upon a strike against all taxes except such as were collected by the "national" Government, and expended by its officials. It seems scarcely worth while to break up the Union, and provoke a rebellion in Ulster, in order to produce such results.

THE ULSTER BAR.

"WE are convinced that Ulster means what she says, and that she will make good every one of her warnings—the true answer to the Bonar Law demonstration is a declaration of Liberal sympathy with the Ulster people." So says the "Star" just before the battle. It has always said the same, according to the "Star". Maybe; if so it has been a voice crying in a Liberal wilderness. It has prophesied in vain. Ulster fighting and Ulster dying in the last ditch has for many a year been the stock resource of Liberal wit. Why, if the party were to follow the "Star", its cartoonists would be stranded for lack of matter. This Liberal recognition of Ulster sincerity and Ulstermen's determination, this taking their resistance to Home Rule seriously, is interesting as a symptom. It is not very easy for a Unionist in his turn to take seriously this just before the battle conversion. He can do little more than smile and smile a trifle cynically when he finds Liberal Home Rulers discovering at the last moment what fine fellows these Ulster Orangemen are. He would like to know what that "Liberal sympathy" is to be which the "Star" tells us is to answer the Unionist demonstration in the Ulster Hall. Are Liberals—of any constellation—thinking that soft words are at this time of day going to turn the heart of the "Scottish Irishman"? He was not much impressed by Gladstone's Union of Hearts. He will want something more than the "Star's" sympathy to make him budge now the fight's begun. The only Liberal sympathy we can fancy moving Belfast Unionists is Liberal retreat from Home Rule. Then no doubt Belfast will move quickly enough—after them.

Still, as we said, this suggested rapprochement of Liberalism and Orangeism is interesting; a piece of kite-flying worth watching. It shows what many Liberals are thinking as they go into this fight, and with what stomach they come to it. No doubt it is wise to correct a false estimate of your enemy, and to give up despising him, or saying you despise him, even on the battlefield itself. But it is very late; too late to correct your plan of campaign, too late to adjust your forces to meet a stronger enemy than you had expected; too late to avoid meeting him at all; too late to retreat; too late for everything except fighting a desperate action or surrender. Evidently Liberals, those at any rate who live in the "Star"-light, perceive that they are in for a desperate business, and wish themselves out of it. The "Star" has gauged the situation rightly enough; it has touched the spot truly. Home Rule is impossible with Ulster against it. Till they have found a way of getting over that bar, Home Rulers merely waste strength in attacking or taking other positions. Till now they have pretended the bar was not there: now they are trying to "negotiate" it (the sporting papers' jargon really serves this time).

Put aside all question of merit and argument; assume, even, that Home Rule ought to be given to Ireland: how, in the view of Liberals' own admissions as to Ulster, can it be done? They do not expect—even in the days of Gladstonian hysteria no Home Rule enthusiast expected—to convert the Unionists of Belfast. It is certain, then, that the Ulstermen will fight Home Rule all through, and that nothing would less modify their Unionism than the passing of a Home Rule Bill into law. The setting up of a Home Rule Government would make them finally irreconcilable. They will refuse to acknowledge any Home Rule Government; they will not pay taxes levied by such a Government; if they are made to—we should say, if there is an attempt to make them—they will fight; not sporadically; they will not pot tax collectors behind hedges; they will fight in organised order; they will be an army in the field. That is the situation the Home Rule Government and the Imperial Government would have to face. What can they do? If Ulster were not coerced, Home Rule obviously collapses; it would be a thing pour rire; and would not long be that, for it would cease to be a thing at all. Can Ulster be squared by the bribe of

a Parliament all to itself? But that would mean confession of ignominious failure; another Home Rule Bill, in which the Nationalists would take no interest; a Bill Nationalist and Unionist alike would reject. No course is left a Government that sets up Home Rule in Ireland but the coercion of the Ulstermen by force; which does not mean a Crimes Act but a strenuous campaign in a civil war. In the long run, of course, the Army, if, if many things—would reduce Ulster. We will not discuss the various ifs—if the officers did not resign in mass, if it did not result in the break-up of the Army and general civil war, and so forth. Assuming that the campaign could be fought through and Ulster were reduced, what Irish Government could survive such a start and stand on such a foundation? No British Ministry would go on with a policy that was going to bring these things to pass. Long before the dénouement the Ministry would stop and Home Rule be abandoned. But there is no need to labour the point. The "Star" itself says plainly, "In our view it is impossible to impose Home Rule on Ulster by force"; but it also says that "Ulster means what she says, and she will make good every one of her warnings". So here is the position according to a Radical, not a Unionist, showing. Ulster will not accept Home Rule without fighting, and Ulster cannot be coerced. How is a Home Rule Ministry to get out of this dilemma? There is no way out, and it reduces the Home Rule movement to futility. Mr. Asquith is setting in motion a policy which neither he nor any of his colleagues has any idea of seeing through to its necessary conclusion. They are gamblers, hoping something may turn up to save them at the last moment. But nothing will turn up.

We have discussed no question of right or wrong; we have been concerned only with the feasibility of Home Rule in view of that which we, and the "Star" believe certain to happen. But morally there is all the difference between open resistance against authority, which is war, and the recognition of authority by living under it and at the same time resisting it. Probably no one would hold that revolt or rebellion is never justifiable; but many, indeed most people, would say that seditious acts done under the protection of the authority assailed are always wrong. In other words, a man must either recognise government or not recognise it. There are circumstances in which he may morally refuse to recognise government at his own peril; but in no circumstance is he justified in attacking government which he is at the same time recognising. Either open rebellion or loyalty. We are not, of course, speaking legally, but morally. The Ulster Unionists may count absolutely on the support of Unionists on this side to the end. It is one of the peculiarities of Home Rule that it is opposed on many grounds and from many different, perhaps hardly consistent, points of view. The Ulster point of view is one; that of other Irish Unionists is not quite the same; the English point of view is another; the Imperial point of view a third. But in every way Home Rule is opposed. Whatever the point of view, Unionists will stand together in this fight. It is true the English Tory's political faith is very different from the Belfast Orangeman's; but in fighting Home Rule we know neither Orangeman nor Tory, neither Irish nor English, but only Unionists.

COAL—RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT.

"THE colliers are back at work, so why bother about the wretched strike any more." So most people say, and after weeks of distress and anxiety the revulsion of feeling is quite natural. But the strike cannot be put by in that easy way. Its history, like the history of the railway trouble last year, is well worth following. During the last few weeks the daily Press, with one or two exceptions, has been singularly at sea. One section has shouted victory for the colliers and the other has heaped shrewish abuse on "selfish" leaders and their duped followers. Both sections have treated the strike as a sporadic outbreak

only concerning colliers and coal-owners. Really the coal trouble is but a symptom of the general unrest. Railwaymen and colliers alike struck for what is aptly termed a living wage. But while the majority of transport-workers were badly paid, in the case of the colliers only a minority fail to make a living wage. The motive of the coal strike was to get better conditions for a small minority, and the Federation deliberately called out tens of thousands of well-paid men—who had nothing but loss to face from a strike—to secure what it believed to be justice for those less fortunate. The movement was long in preparation, and took most careful engineering, but eventually every section came into line. Then began the old trouble of exaggeration. The men "like it hot", and believed the stories told them. A week's national stoppage, the nation is on its knees, and we can dictate our own terms. For months the men worked hard to make money, and the coal output was enormous. But the very energy put into their jobs, their expressed intention of "saving up" for the trouble, and the comings and goings of the leaders warned clear-sighted people what to expect. Coal reserves were piled up in every direction, and when the strike came the leaders slowly realised their mistake. The railways and the bulk of other coal-users were ready for them. Many works they might close, and most railways disorganise, but where they expected paralysis they only succeeded in causing loss and irritation. The leaders did not even fully realise the position when the Board of Trade conciliators had secured the consent of two-thirds of the owners to the principle of a minimum wage. They were in a tight corner. Practically two-thirds of the coal-fields already had a minimum wage in effect, and if the men were sent back it would be at once evident that they had been uselessly called out, as district settlements could have been managed without any strike at all. Besides the walls of Jericho were to fall at once, and the order of all in or all out had been well drilled into every pitman in the country. Then came the Government Bill. Here again they blundered. Even the present Government turned, and in spite of every attempt on the part of the Labour members figures were rigidly excluded from the Bill. The Government gave the collier the right to a minimum wage, but insisted on this being discussed and settled locally, and refused the ex parte figures of the Federation schedule. Finding their flank turned, the leaders this time determined to climb out on the backs of their followers, and it was upon the whole body of colliers that they cast the responsibility of continuing the strike. To the general surprise firebrand South Wales voted for going back. Yorkshire, Lancashire, and Scotland, keener and more hard-headed, saw that from their point of view nothing had been gained, that their schedule was refused, and that arbitration after all was the final end. Anger grew out of annoyance, and they bitterly cursed their leaders, whom they roundly accused of once again fooling them. But the vote was really not for continuing the strike; it was their only means of expressing dissatisfaction, and when their executive, truly interpreting this feeling, sent them back to work, with some few exceptions they obeyed. But is the struggle altogether over? The Federation has certainly been gravely weakened by the strange attitude of South Wales, and we may well agree with the miners' leaders who tell us many years will pass before we see another national coal strike.

On the whole we believe the colliers have gained by the strike. They have been given legal recognition of the principle of the minimum wage, and with that recognition means for putting the principle into practice by mutual agreement if possible, if not by arbitration. This is a long step forward. Already many District Boards have been formed, and most have selected their chairman. How will these boards work, and on what principle?—for on them depends the future peace of the coal-fields. The minimum wage schedule must in the long run be mainly the work of the chairman of every particular board. We do not believe that for one moment a chairman will accept the Federation schedule as the last word, nor on

the other hand will he swallow everything put forward by the owners. The first rule must be that whatever is settled the wage in any given district must be a living wage having regard to the conditions of the district, for that practically is the principle of the Government Bill. Next, no doubt the fact that permanently higher prices will be charged for coal will affect any owner's schedule of costs based on present prices; and then again, on the other side some means will have to be found to insure the coal-getter against the abnormal places difficulty. We hope chairmen of District Boards will consider themselves as sitting in a double capacity—as judges to sift the figures of owners and men, and as a jury to find the facts and to arrive at a conclusion based on the needs of every particular district. It may even be possible under the District Boards system to avoid the closing of many poor mines; for, as there is no hard and fast legal figure in the Act, a special rate for a special place might always be established. The one bright spot for the coal future is that there seems a growing disposition on both sides to make the best of the boards. Agreement will be reached in most mines, and the settlement will affect less amenable districts. If the men of any district refuse to accept a chairman's finding, there may of course be fresh trouble, but that will be local, and without effect on the general settlement.

The settlement of this strike by no means puts an end to labour unrest. For the present we believe there will be comparative calm, as the funds of many of the militant unions have been seriously depleted by out-of-work payments due to unemployment from lack of coal. But the minimum wage principle has now received legal sanction, and it is a sanction which must be extended in future to other trades. Since the growth of capitalist combinations and the decay of the old master and servant personal interest, the wage-earner, taught by his union, has more and more come to demand a greater share in the profits of the industry to which he belongs. Nor will he be denied, because in the end he has the power of the vote. Wage-earners other than colliers would never have gone through the last few weeks without grumbling if they had not been in sympathy with what they believed the colliers were out for. Privation, misery, and cold have been grimly and quietly borne. "We can wait for our turn", they are saying. "But this is revolution", whispers the frightened pessimist. Although not revolution, it is something just as effective in the long run—a demand steadily applied first of all to getting the necessities of existence and then, as these are satisfied, a share in the good things of life. What effect the change may have on prices and on our fiscal system is another matter; we shall need a tariff to meet and to protect the altered standard of living; and wage-earners will then hardly be slow to accept the change.

LIBEL AND TRADE UNION IMMUNITY.

THE decision of the Court of Appeal in Messrs. Vacher and Sons' action for libel against the London Society of Compositors has not attracted the attention its importance deserves. It came in the closing days of the coal strike, and perhaps with the coming of the Easter holidays people were glad to give trade union affairs the go-by. Yet it is directly apropos of what has been haunting the public mind ever since the railway and the coal strikes; the question what is to be the legal position of trade unions in the future. Nothing has been more momentous in the history of trade unionism than the passing of the Trade Disputes Act of 1906, which was avowedly intended to protect trade union funds from liability for the wrongful acts of its officials and members. This most startling Act was forced upon the Liberal Government against its own original views; and it is arguable, and is maintained reasonably by many, that much of the masterful conduct of the trade unions since may be traced to this unjustifiable Act. The problem in trade unionism seems to be how shall the State resume that control over trade

unionist action which it ought never to have given up? First of all we need to know exactly how far the Trade Disputes Act really goes. We suppose that most people have a general notion that the freedom of trade unions without responsibility would only extend to their operations in trade disputes. But the decision of the majority of the Court of Appeal, Lords Justices Vaughan Williams and Kennedy, goes further than this. They hold that there need not even be a trade dispute if the union is acting within its functions of a trade union. For the purpose of carrying out an object within its powers of trade union "as such", to use the inelegant legal expression, it can therefore libel, that is lie about, anyone it chooses, an employer, or workmen, or any member of the public, and it has a "privilege" undreamed of by any other libeller. It can only do wrong when it ceases to act as a trade union. If it starts a general newspaper, for which it would not be entitled to use the funds, then it would no longer be protected but would be liable for a libel like any other newspaper proprietor. There could hardly be a more extreme example than immunity from the consequences of libel, except immunity to commit actual crime, to illustrate the privilege, the only privilege of serious import which any association of citizens now possesses, that the Trade Disputes Act has conferred on trade unions.

Evidently the decision will furnish additional cogent arguments for those who urge that restraints should be placed on trade unions. Immunity for wrong-doing even in contemplation and furtherance of trade disputes is bad enough, but worse when the immunity reaches still further and confers the power of libelling at large. Whether this is definitively to be the law is not at present certain, as there will doubtless be an appeal to the House of Lords. The less extreme view that would be presented by the appellants, Messrs. Vacher and Sons, would be that of the dissenting judgment of Lord Justice Farwell, who held that the immunity of trade unions only exists to cover their wrongful acts when they are actually engaged in a trade dispute; and that the real question is what is a trade dispute? In his opinion this is the condition which must be read into every line of the Act; whilst his colleagues read the first sub-section of section four without this condition, and thus get the extreme form of immunity from it. Suppose the House of Lords should ultimately decide this view to be right, would it satisfy the public conscience as a standard for trade union law? It can hardly be believed that lying and slandering can be consecrated even by the existence of a trade dispute. Besides, a trade dispute, as the majority of the Appeal Court appear to understand it, may be almost any sort of trumpety quarrel. They were confident in their opinions that the disagreements of Messrs. Vacher and their men, in which the union intervened, was a trade dispute within the meaning of the Act; so that in any case the action ought to be dismissed. If the House of Lords finds they are right, then the restriction Lord Justice Farwell desires to place on trade unions does not go for much, as a trade dispute might mean anything.

What the decision has done is to deprive Messrs. Vacher and Sons of the right to have two questions tried by a jury. The first is as to the nature of the libel; they are prevented from defending their business and personal character. The second is as to whether there was such a trade dispute as is intended by the Act. If the Act is to be construed by the judges without sending the question as to the nature of the dispute to trial, then there is no means of ascertaining the rights and wrongs of any dispute where employers charge trade unions with libel. This is the less defensible as, in the converse case of the union officials charging the employer with libelling them, the employer must defend himself on the merits, and he cannot have the action dismissed without being heard by virtue of the Trade Disputes Act. Lord Justice Farwell thought Messrs. Vacher's action ought to be tried on the question of what was the nature of the dispute. It would be in accordance with what the House of Lords has laid down in previous cases, if it

held that judges cannot determine the existence of a real trade dispute unless the facts are thoroughly investigated. This will almost certainly be held unless the House of Lords upholds the view that the immunity of trade unions is limitless, provided they are acting in their proper character, in any circumstances.

It is peculiarly inappropriate that libel should be exempt under the Trade Disputes Act, as it perverts the truth as to trade disputes so essential to be known for the guidance of the sympathies of the public. Encouragement of the dissemination of lies cannot be desired by any fair-minded trade union official. He might defend violence more plausibly than meanness; and the meanness of libel would not only obscure the issues but embitter them. It is inconceivable that anyone, trade unionist or not, could believe in the desirability of allowing trade unions to publish libels with impunity.

THE TURKS, AND THE POWERS.

THOUGH the Turkish elections are not yet over, the result is no longer in doubt, and there is no valid reason for discrediting the forecast of the "Times" correspondent. The Committee of Union and Progress will win a sweeping victory, for the Opposition has failed to make itself seriously felt in any direction. The arguments which in a country like the Ottoman Empire can have any effect on the electors have all been in the mouths, or hands, of the agents of the Government. It is unnecessary at the moment to denounce the methods usually employed by Governments of this kind in this kind of election. They are at all events inevitable in Turkey, young or old, but the extraneous forces that have aided the Government are well worth more than superficial attention. The principal factor at work has undoubtedly been patriotism. It is quite certain that the electors will give the candidates one very clear mandate—there is to be no surrender in Tripoli. What the leaders of the Committee of Union and Progress have stated all along is absolutely correct; they could not, if they would, accept the Annexation Decree of Italy as a basis for negotiations. The only possible basis for them can be found in an unconditional withdrawal of the decree first of all. This, as things are now, is an impossibility for Italy. We are therefore just where we were at the start—in an impasse, and, until something much more decisive happens, we shall not see either side emerge from it.

After the elections are completed we shall see another attempt made by the Powers to induce the Porte to accept mediation. No doubt some effort will be made to impress it with a sense of the ultimate hopelessness of resistance. But any such steps are bound to fail, for nothing has happened to convince the Turk that he cannot beat the Italians if given a fair chance. The only step likely to impress him sufficiently to make him yield is to persuade him that there will be a combination of the Powers against Turkey, and that will not be. The Italians therefore will have in the end to proceed to their ultima ratio, whatever that may be. If it be an attack on the Dardanelles, it will prove a very risky proceeding. There is some reason to believe that the Straits may be one of the few spots, if not the only spot in the Empire, where the defences are adequate to the requirements and where the funds granted have been rightly expended. The Italians have great confidence in their fleet, but to force the passage might be a very serious business, and there is no actual guarantee of success. Italy will never risk her fleet save in the last resort. The mere presence of submarine mines would not, of course, prevent a powerful fleet from entering the Sea of Marmora, though a few vessels might be lost. The main point of the battle would be an artillery duel between the battleships and the forts, which are alleged to be enormously powerful in their armament. The result of such a struggle is by no means settled beforehand. An Italian check would be disastrous. Italian superiority is admitted only at sea. To land an Italian army anywhere where the Turkish regulars are to be found in

any numbers is by no means the object of the Italian authorities. If the Italian fleet were checked or seriously maimed, a very grave situation would arise, not only for Italy but for any European Powers that have dependencies in Northern Africa. The serious causes for misgiving that exist already in that region were set out in the SATURDAY REVIEW a fortnight ago, and they have recently been confirmed by the competent correspondents of leading journals. Egypt, Tunis, and Algeria, even India itself, might feel the contre-coup of an Italian disaster, and the untoward results for any of us can hardly be adequately measured beforehand, though they may be apprehended.

How grave the apprehensions thus aroused are may be gauged by the tone of the Press in countries friendly to Italy. This feeling of anxiety undoubtedly extends to the rulers, who are well aware that the immobility of the Italian forces in face of a vastly inferior foe, both in point of numbers and equipment, is beginning to have a disintegrating influence on the prestige of those Powers among their Mohammedan subjects. Therefore in the interests of us all it would be well that Italy should strike some decisive blow or take some impressive step which will demonstrate to the Turks the uselessness of further resistance. But how is this to be done?

It is recognised now on all hands that both the diplomacy and the strategy of the campaign have been shockingly mismanaged by the Italian authorities. In the first place every effort should have been put forth to make friends with the Arabs, who originally were by no means in love with the Turkish régime. If matters had been directed by men who really understood the people, it should not have been difficult to make them believe that the Italians came as deliverers, but it is certain that now they have allowed themselves to be regarded as enemies of the Faith as well as aggressors. The Sennussi, who seem to have held aloof for some time, have definitely come down on the Turkish side of the fence and this from a religious and military point of view may have very unpleasant consequences not for the Italians alone. So far as any Italian manoeuvres such as dropping bombs out of aeroplanes have been successful, they seem to have irritated rather than awed the enemy. The Arab is quite shrewd enough to see that the large armies of the infidel, armed with the most modern weapons, dare not venture beyond the range of his ships' guns.

It is therefore hardly to be wondered at that the Turkish elections are certain to give a mandate of no surrender to the Ministry and will strengthen enormously the bellicose policy of the Committee of Union and Progress. A few weeks since the Italian papers were showing considerable irritation because the Powers were not hastening to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for Signor Giolitti's Cabinet. In the circumstances it is impossible to conceive a more impudent claim. There was only one of two things to be done by Italy to justify such a demand—either to withdraw the unfortunate Decree of Annexation or to occupy Tripoli effectively. Till one of these events has taken place Italy cannot in any sense be regarded as entitled to claim assistance from the Powers. Nevertheless in self-protection some of them may find it necessary to take action. There is only one Great Power besides Italy which will not mind an open quarrel with Turkey. That is Russia, and it is certain that of late there has been co-operation preparing between Russia and Italy. It is admitted, indeed, that Italy has been considerate in her action so far as Russia is concerned. The visit of the King of Montenegro to St. Petersburg a few months ago was a sufficiently striking circumstance in itself, and when his near relationship to the King of Italy is remembered, it was even more remarkable than it seemed at first sight. It is quite certain that in the event of trouble in the Near East some common action on the part of Russia, Italy, and their satellites has been secured. Unfortunately the outcome of the elections will tend to stiffen the determination of the Young Turks to carry out the Ottomanising policy which has already proved so grave a source of discontent. That any such action

would be madness at the present time is, we fear, hardly conclusive against its prosecution. In any case, M. de Giers, the new Russian Ambassador at Constantinople, will not prove as friendly to the Turks as his predecessor. The aggressive action of Turkey in Persia has only been tolerated by Russia for her own purposes, and we may expect to find her exacting due compensation at her own time. The other member of the Dual Alliance will hardly interfere, but will watch with anxiety the development of events.

THE CITY.

IN spite of the holidays and the rather high charges made for carrying-over in some departments, business has not been seriously interrupted on the Stock Exchange this week. Some heavy profit-taking in shares which have recently experienced big rises called a temporary halt on sensational upward movements, but the stock offered was soon absorbed and new high records were scored in Marconis, National Telephone Deferred, the Underground railway group and Shell Transports. The continued activity in Marconi shares, encouraged by extensive purchases from New York, has been the most spectacular feature of the markets. An important announcement, as a result of Mr. Godfrey Isaacs' successful visit to the United States, is expected shortly. This will no doubt have reference to financial schemes and to the extension and development of the Marconi wireless system. It is hinted that the American Marconi Company, which has decided to increase its capital to \$10,000,000, will become predominant in the Marconi group of companies. Meanwhile the parent company's shares are "talked" to 10, and whether such a price is justified by facts or not, well-informed interests appear to have every confidence in the strength of the market at the present high quotation.

The renewed demand for National Telephone Deferred stock is based upon revised and conservative estimates of the probable price to be paid by the Government for the company's assets. On these calculations it is thought that a quotation of 160 will not be an exaggerated estimate of the chances for the deferred stock. Among Underground railway stocks the most conspicuous advances have been in Underground Electric Railway income bonds and shares. This is attributable to a more general appreciation of dividend prospects as a result of the absorption of the London General Omnibus Company. The rise in the 1s. "A" ("Suffragette") shares has been truly remarkable and indicates a robust optimism regarding the amount of profits that will be available for distribution. L.G.O. stock, assenting and dissenting, has also advanced very rapidly, the market being extremely narrow and sensitive. Metropolitan and Districts were subjected to heavy realisations at one time, but held their ground well in the circumstances.

Turning to the more staid sections of the "House", Consols have been depressed by the knowledge that there will be no sinking fund purchases this year, while the introduction of the Home Rule Bill may have had some influence in lowering the quotation. In the Home railway department the tone has been less firm. Now that the coal strike is declared over, more attention is being given to the probable financial effects of the tremendous loss of traffic. Dividend prospects for the current half-year are not at all encouraging, but it is too early yet to enter into details, and one favourable factor in connexion with the strike is that it has provided a lesson in the possibilities of working economies on several lines.

Canadian Pacific stock reached a new high record at over 254 on the rumours of the directors' intention to separate the land assets from the railway undertaking, which would probably permit higher dividends being paid by the latter. Grand Trunk issues have also come into favour once more, the report for the last half-year being considered very satisfactory. An issue of £1,250,000 of 4 per cent. debentures at 98½ will shortly be made. The progress of Canadian

enterprise reflects itself elsewhere than in the railways—for instance the Dominion Trust after paying its 8 per cent. dividend, which absorbs \$64,866, transfers more than double this amount to reserve.

The upward movement in Wall Street has been hindered by Mr. Roosevelt's success at Illinois, indicating that he has not yet completely eliminated himself by his Radical doctrines. Among foreign railway securities Mexican Railway ordinary was favourably influenced by the half-yearly dividend at the rate of 1½ per cent., this being in accordance with the best expectations.

On the rumours of an agreement to supply the Admiralty with oil fuel for the Navy, Shell Transport shares have registered a new high record. It is understood in the market that a contract to supply 1,000,000 tons of oil per annum has been arranged on terms which will provide a handsome profit to the company. The shares are expected to go well over 6. Another feature in the Oil share market has been Ural Caspians, which company is virtually controlled by the Shell interests. Standard Oil of Mexico shares have continued their advance. It is stated that the company has resumed boring in the well from which a large oil supply is hoped for.

The Rubber share market remains conspicuously firm with a steady though unostentatious flow of investment orders. Some effort has been made to infuse life into the Mining markets, but without great success. Paris buying of Kaffirs was met by selling orders here, and when Tanganyikas were advanced shares came out from the Continent. The Nigerian Tin market is waiting for a further official report on the Anglo-Continental Company's tin lode.

TCHEKOFF IN LONDON.

By JOHN PALMER.

IT is often assumed, because a small section of the public has learned to appreciate Ibsen, and because Mr. Flannel Bannel has learned what to say about Ibsen in the newspapers, that we are therefore more capable than our predecessors of dealing with new ideas and of jumping at the value of new methods in art and literature. Critics and public believe to-day, as they have always believed, in their ability to keep level with the original products of their period because they have succeeded in thoroughly grasping the value and importance of ideas peculiar to the generation which immediately preceded their own. Mr. William Archer has dragooned the intellectually accessible public and the junior critics of his time into thinking and writing in a sane and reasonable manner about Ibsen, while Mr. Shaw, who by precept and example has founded a school of dramatic criticism for the intelligent appreciation of his work, has drilled the London playgoer into turning up at his plays for hundreds of nights in succession, and has hypnotised the whole Press into believing that he is an inexhaustible fountain of good copy. This is all very encouraging, and quite in the right direction; but we must not assume, because the better sort of playgoer and the worse sort of critic has been carefully trained to repeat opinionative commonplaces about Ibsen and Shaw, that we are necessarily more open-minded or tolerant of what is new than Mr. Redford's predecessor in the position of King's Examiner of Plays. This gentleman, a Mr. Pigott, greatly admired and respected in his day, gave as his reason for licensing several plays of Ibsen that they were too utterly silly to have any effect, good or bad, upon anybody. To-day, of course, we are all quite competent to laugh at Mr. Pigott, and to wonder how the people who believed in him came so resolutely to stick in the mud of their time. Nevertheless we are fully as dense to the appeal of anything really new as was Mr. Pigott when he made his interesting confession about Ibsen before the Parliamentary Committee of '92. If we escape the stigma of having stoned our own particular prophet of the day, it will be more by good luck than management. We may escape, as others have escaped, for

the reason that we have no prophet of our own sufficiently in advance of his time or sufficiently a genius to be misunderstood and ignored; and we shall thus be spared the opportunity of looking foolish on a large scale in the eyes of posterity. That we should look as foolish as every other generation has looked in similar circumstances there is no doubt whatever; for within the last twelve months the most exclusive, superior and advanced audience in London has succeeded, as thousands of audiences similarly qualified have succeeded before it, in looking foolish on a scale which can only be described as small for the reason that its mistake will never be set right so publicly and universally as the mistake which their predecessors made about Ibsen. The mistake of the Stage Society about Tchekoff will never be fully discovered in this country; for it is in the interest of no particular group or clique to drill the public into realising it; and Tchekoff, not being a social missionary, will never become a watchword with reformers and social prophets.

Tchekoff's career in London is disgraceful for all concerned. As one of the most celebrated European dramatists he could not be altogether ignored by the various societies whose mission it is to discover for their members the acknowledged masterpieces of dramatic literature. Nevertheless Tchekoff's first appearance was not in London, but in Glasgow, where Mr. George Calderon was invited to produce "The Seagull" at Mr. Wareing's repertory theatre. I shall always regret that I did not see Mr. Calderon's production; for I believe it was really adequate. The Stage Society followed in London in May 1911 with "The Cherry Orchard", Tchekoff's masterpiece. The production was not so bad but that an audience fairly intelligent and fully awake might have seen through it to the novelty and value of Tchekoff's technical method, and have realised that Tchekoff, having seen far beyond the noses of any member of the Stage Society, had something inestimably precious to show them. The actual reception they gave to the play was, and will forever be, the foundation of my personal conviction that in spite of Mr. William Archer and Mr. Bernard Shaw (or because of them) we are in the lump as soundly and unshakeably asleep, so far as art is concerned, as ever we were. And the audience was wisdom itself in comparison with the Press notices which appeared in celebration of this production. The older and wiser the critic, the more completely he misunderstood everything that occurred. I well remember the amazement with which I read these notices on the morrow of my own burning conviction that I had seen the first great and original comedy produced since the beginning of my critical career upon this REVIEW. I have carefully preserved these criticisms, and I mean to re-read them whenever I find myself beginning to believe in the dignity and usefulness of my profession.

A fortnight ago Mr. Maurice Elvey produced Tchekoff's "The Seagull" at the Little Theatre for the Adelphi Play Society. Players, audience and critics had in the meantime been instructed how to pretend a wisdom if they had it not (which is the true secret of criticism) by Mr. George Calderon's preface to an admirable translation.* One might reasonably have expected at the Little Theatre an excellent performance (Tchekoff's original heroine was in the cast), an appreciative audience, and critics who were not obviously preparing to denounce a third-rate farcical melodrama. As it turned out, things were a little better in the auditorium; but the performance was worse. Mr. Calderon was advertised to lecture the audience on Tchekoff's method, an admirable precaution in view of what had formerly occurred at the Stage Society. Luckily Mr. Calderon did not appear. His lecture would only have added to the general confusion. Whether he himself perceived this in time, and tactfully withdrew; or whether he merely missed the train was not explained. In the absence of any express contradiction from

Mr. Calderon himself I shall assume that his absence was his private remedy for an impossible situation.

The bad character of the Adelphi Society's production was directly measured by the authority and merit of the principal players. I understand that Mr. Maurice Elvey, the Society's producer, is a young man. He would therefore be entirely unable to compel Miss Gertrude Kingston or the Princess Bariatinsky to behave as she should. Anyhow, the play did not seem to have been produced at all. The result will be measured by anyone who has read—with understanding—a line of Tchekoff's comedy. ("The Seagull" is as truly a comedy as "The Cherry Orchard", despite the pistol-shot at the end.) Not only does Tchekoff's play depend absolutely on the cumulative effect of a method which concerns itself rather with groups than with the individuals composing them; but he has in several passages of the play successfully portrayed group emotions. It is a commonplace of psychology that a group or crowd of people will behave collectively in a manner different from that in which any one of its members would behave. This commonplace, refined at times in the most subtle fashion, Tchekoff has successfully illustrated in his comedies. As soon as we realise that the players, all and several, are hero of the piece the play falls naturally into perfect form. I dealt at length, in noticing the Stage Society's production of "The Cherry Orchard", with Tchekoff's technical skill in building up an impression of complete unity of form and idea by means of a style apparently discursive and in defiance of all the commonplaces of structure. Order comes into a superficial chaos as soon as we shift our view from the fortunes of this or that particular person of the play to the fortunes of the group. In the Adelphi Society's production neither Miss Kingston nor the Princess Bariatinsky seemed to realise that her individual part was important only in correlation with the rest. It was not possible to be angry with Miss Kingston, for the whole tradition of British acting, which she so admirably adorns, was against her in this particular venture. But there was no sort of excuse for the Princess Bariatinsky. I hope I have made it clear how exactly these players offended. They had read their parts with care; they played with energy and skill; individually they were not seriously wrong for more than half the time; and they heavily impressed the audience. In spite of all this—or, rather, because of it—they succeeded in completely upsetting the balance and rhythm of the play. So far as Tchekoff's play was concerned my sensations were exactly what they would have been if I saw the two legs of a man I respected suddenly start walking in different directions.

No; we are as blind in our day as was Mr. Pigott in his. Of course, we shall abolish the Censor. But shall we really be better off for that? It seems to me we shall derive from it only one advantage, and that the advantage is of a rather doubtful kind: we shall be the more free to make fools of ourselves in the eyes of posterity.

ULSTER.

THE savage leopardess, and she-wolves and bears
Cherish their offspring in the solitude,
And red-eyed tigresses whose trade is blood,
And female panthers, and jackals in their lairs.
The lowliest, sullenest mother creature wears
In her hot heart a jewel of motherhood,
And knoweth darkly that the only good
Is to defend and succour her rude heirs.

And thou whose might is from the east unto the west
Whose Front is of chilled iron and fine gold,
Who yet in glory and honour goest drest,
O great-thewed mother of us all, behold
How this thy sturdy child, who is foully sold,
Fights that he be not banished from thy breast!

T. W. H. C.

* "Two Plays by Tchekoff" ("The Seagull" and "The Cherry Orchard"). Translated by George Calderon. London: Grant Richards. 1912. 2s. 6d. net.

THE NEW FAR-EASTERN ROOMS IN THE LOUVRE.

BY ROYALL TYLER.

AT last the works of art brought back from Northern China and Chinese Turkestan by the Missions Pelliot and Chavannes (1906-9) are exhibited in the Louvre. On Wednesday and Saturday afternoons (*jusqu'à nouvel ordre*) they may be examined in some new rooms beyond those occupied by the Grandidier collection of Chinese porcelain, the entrance to which is by the *Porte Jean Goujon*, on the *Quai du Louvre*. In quantity these expeditions did not yield much fruit, but quality is another matter, and we must be truly grateful for anything that serves to illustrate the early periods of Chinese art, its character and origins. China's reputation as a country of very ancient artistic culture has been taken on trust, for such actual objects as we have had the opportunity of seeing have been for the most part recent in date compared even with Christian European art. Apart from ritual bronze vessels like those in the *Musée Cernuschi* in Paris and a few at South Kensington, which are a constant object of controversy as to date, we have seen little but paintings, of which a very few may go back as far as, say, the mosaics of Ravenna, though their dates also are usually difficult to determine. The difficulty of making excavations has prevented us from satisfying the curiosity aroused by the thought of this huge and ancient land, which until a few years ago supplied us with nothing more stirring than porcelain of a markedly industrial character. We now have the beautiful pottery of the Sung and Yuan dynasties; but it has come so late that the famous collections of Chinese ceramics contain hardly any of it—as you may see as you walk through the Grandidier rooms—partly because it was unknown when the big collectors of to-day were forming their taste, and partly, I fear, because it is not yet expensive enough. Indeed I may not talk of Sung pottery here—there is nothing in the Louvre with which to illustrate what I might have to say. The contents of the new rooms go back to earlier, though equally interesting periods.

It has long been known that a strong influence was exercised on the beginnings of Buddhist sculpture in Northern India by the Greek art of Bactria. This province of Alexander's empire was ruled by Greek dynasties down to the latter part of the second century B.C., when it was conquered by the Parthians, and it has given its name to the modern Bokhara. Nearly fifteen years ago M. Foucher brought back fragments of sculpture in stone and plaster from Gandhāra and Peshawar which admirably illustrate this affiliation and have been quite rightly placed in the new Department. M. Pelliot entered Chinese Turkestan from China, and searched along the Kashgar Daria and Yarkand Daria. In that region, at places called Tum-chuk and Tum-hwang, he found most exciting sculpture in clay and wood, which, according to the explorer himself, dates from the eighth century A.D. Certain of these pieces undoubtedly resemble M. Foucher's finds; they are under the influence of what he calls the Greco-Buddhist school. But M. Foucher places his fragments in the first century or thereabouts, and one would like to know what went on in the seven centuries that separate them from these things from Turkestan. It should moreover be noticed that Tum-chuk has yielded up, side by side with the pieces just mentioned, fragments, some of them of great beauty, that are entirely Chinese in character, and utterly different from the others. The case of objects from Tum-chuk contains two or three little heads in a sort of plaster, polychromed, that are pure masterpieces of a radically Chinese type. When the results of these missions were first seen in Paris people at once began to cry out that the problem of the origins of Chinese figure-sculpture was solved. The Greek art of Bactria had produced the Greco-Buddhist school, which in its turn gave rise to this newly-discovered school of Turkestan, and eventually planted an offshoot of Hellenic plastic genius in China itself. After all the talk about the tremendous antiquity of

Chinese art it was an irresistible anticlimax to make Chinese sculpture, in its origin, a bastard of the Occident. In reality the problem is like to be much less simple, for in addition to the fragments from Turkestan, the French missions found, in the provinces of Shan-Tung and Ho-Nan, sculpture of an earlier period. In these provinces there are great numbers of tombs and tiny chapels to contain funeral offerings, the walls of which are covered with sculpture in such low relief that rubbings on paper may easily be taken from it. Indeed the Chinese appear to have made use of storied walls and steles as lithographic stones from an early period. Dr. Stein, I believe, brought back a lithographic impression dating from the seventh century. The rubbings made by the French missions have been published by M. Chavannes: "*Mission archéologique dans la Chine septentrionale*", and some of them were exhibited last January in the *Musée des Arts Décoratifs*. They are of the very highest interest, and many are dated. Thanks to them we know that under the Han dynasty, in the early part of the second century of our era, there was a Chinese school of sculpture which flourished and produced work of the greatest distinction, and was quite independent of any Western influence. Nothing prouder in drawing than these processions of men, horses, camels and elephants has ever been seen. They have the same Chinese flavour in the actual use of line and ornamentation that has persisted to the last; but here all is supple and living, an art still in touch with nature, delighting in the interpretation of observed character and movement, far simpler and more direct, far nearer our Western hearts, I believe, than any other product of Cathay I have ever seen. Style and convention is everything in this school, but the synthesis is rich and powerful. Before such work there is no possibility of feeling the lassitude and indifference induced by looking long at the figured decoration of Chinese porcelain or later Chinese painting. This school of sculpture appears to have existed for several hundred years, by no means unchanged however, as the rubbings from reliefs of the sixth and later centuries show. It would be rash and gratuitous to combat the share of Buddhist art in its later developments; but by that time Buddhist art itself had become saturated with native Chinese character. After all allowances for extraneous influence have been made, the fact remains that if one puts the earliest known Chinese works of art, the ritual bronze vases, some of which are doubtless to be dated centuries before our era, beside the reliefs from Ho-Nan, both show the same essential character, and though there are no ritual bronzes in which the human form is portrayed, if the men who imagined such representations of beasts as sometimes adorn them did not use the human figure as well, it was not because they were unable to do so. Besides, all this inquiry as to whether a school of the dignity and grace possessed by this one is autochthonous or not is merely pedantry. It is great art and stands on its own ground; and there's an end to it.

Little by little, more work of the Han, Wei and T'ang periods—roughly the first eight or nine centuries of our era—is coming to Europe. There are mirrors in a curious sort of bronze that seems to contain a large admixture of silver, pottery and statuettes. There is no doubt Greek influence in the delicate chasing on the backs of some of the mirrors, but always well assimilated; the country that possessed a tradition as strong and fruitful as that which shows in the outspokenly Chinese bronzes and mirrors had an artistic digestion capable of assimilating anything. The new rooms contain a good case of mirrors, among which is a little flat bronze of a lion which looks much more like the superb "Hunnish" gold ornaments found in Southern Russia than anything Chinese. On the whole the pottery is disappointing; though there is enough to show the general character of early Chinese ceramics, a few individually beautiful pieces are badly wanted. There are vases and other vessels: a body of red earth sometimes adorned with a band of leaf and animal decoration in relief, and covered with a dark green or yellow enamel. The enamel is seldom of great beauty, and the relief is always

an imitation of that found on the bronzes. Indeed even the best pieces of pottery are obvious imitations of bronzes, in form, decoration and all. The statuettes brought back by the missions are also poor. It would surely have been a good thing to spend a few hundred francs in buying a couple of good ones here in Paris. It is true that among the thousands of red or white earth figures that have come from the tombs of Ho-Nan in the last years only a very few stand out from the industrial ruck, but those few are imperishably beautiful.

In Paris the most interesting piece the new rooms contain was bought—a stele of the sort from which the rubbings were made. It is of grey terra-cotta, in which the relief is cut. I believe that the finest of two Chow (1127-247 B.C.) bronze vessels was also not brought back by the mission. This ought not to detract from the mission's glory however, for it did plenty of excellent work, witness the fragments of wall-paintings and photographs of many others, in which more Greco-Buddhist influence is obvious. There is also a collection of fragments of stuffs, which are as yet unlabelled, and the lack of any apology for a catalogue leaves one devoured with curiosity about two bits of Byzantine textiles. Were they found in Turkestan? We have heard of silks going from China westwards in those days, but here seems to be the opposite case.

Now is a good time to go to see the fine series of early bronze ritual vases owned by the Musée Cernuschi, near the entrance to the Parc Monceau, where a loan exhibition of early Chinese paintings has just been opened. Several fine pieces of the Sung and Yuan periods are to be seen there.

THE JENA SYMPHONY.

By JOHN F. RUNCIMAN.

MR. LANDON RONALD is far too earnest and capable a musician to be suspected of tugging at the leg of that patient animal the British public. We are bound to believe he was perfectly serious in announcing the first performance in London of a symphony recently found in some musty cupboard or on some dusty library-shelf at Jena as the first performance in London of an early Beethoven symphony; and when a man cherishes a conviction such as that, to tell him he is wrong seems as heartless as drowning a newly-born kitten. I have watched the heartbroken mother searching from room to room, mewing sorrowfully the while; and it grieves me to think of Mr. Ronald diving mournfully into odd recesses of all the chambers of his mind to find good reasons to think that his foster-child is genuine and alive. On the other hand many human beings are never so obstinately and cheerfully confident as when they are upholding some preposterous thesis, such as, for instance, that the earth is flat and the sun goes round it or that four and four make nine-and-a-half; and, it may well be, Mr. Ronald is looking down on us non-believers with kindly pity. Whatever his belief may be, I cannot possibly accept this new work as authentic. Now I call it advisedly; for beyond the facts that the discovered parts are written on what appears to be, and perhaps is, old music-paper and in what looks like faded ink, and that Beethoven or Bethoven is given, on two of the parts, as the composer's name, there is absolutely no evidence to connect Beethoven with so commonplace a perpetration. Not the most unintelligent of hanging judges would dare to convict an accused man on such a complete lack of evidence.

If the composition is commonplace, I may be asked, what does it matter whether Beethoven wrote it or not? It does matter. It would be worth having ever so insignificant a genuine juvenile thing by so significant and mighty a composer. It might stimulate Messrs. Parry, Stanford, Mackenzie and Co., whose achievements reach the same high level of mediocrity, to persevere in the hope of ultimately pulling off a Ninth symphony or Missa Solemnis. Should anyone urge that to encourage these gentlemen to go on composing

when it is so easy to leave off would be against public policy, it might be answered that there are some other composers, deserving cases worthy of encouragement; or, in the last resort, that some future musician-psychologist may draw instructive lessons from the fact that the mighty flood of Beethoven's music began with so mean a stream. Neither the musician-psychologist nor promising composers, however, can draw material or comfort from this work. It is not by Beethoven. The suspicion that it may be must be met with the axiom that it may not be, and that literature and art of all sorts abound with examples of forgeries perpetrated not with any notion of pecuniary profit but from a vain and ridiculous desire to create a sensation. There are picture-dealers in Paris who have ateliers full of hacks engaged at a hundred sous a day in manufacturing bogus Corots and Millets, mainly for the American market; but there are not, so far as I know, any firms whose trade is in bogus Beethoven or Mozart symphonies. With some comparatively unimportant exceptions the big musical forgeries have been done either from the motive of vanity or as a sort of idiotic but eventually harmless kind of practical joke. The joker, like the gentleman who cut "Bill Stumps his Mark" on a stone and sold it for half-a-sovereign, looks on, gratified and amused, while the pundits and those mysterious frauds called experts discuss the great discovery. Whoever may prove to be responsible for this Beethoven discovery will in all likelihood never himself be discovered; but joke there must be. The extreme probability of this being the case together with the extreme improbability of Beethoven having sent a symphony to Jena and then having forgotten it compel one to reject the work altogether. There is no score and Beethoven would not have sent band-parts of a symphony for "consideration". He is said to have sent other works, also for consideration—not for a consideration—but Professor Stein has not yet dug them out.

So the case stands thus: in favour of the piece being by Beethoven, no evidence; against, very great improbability; finally, against the probability, the stuff, scheme, structure of the thing itself. It is conventional, and that need not surprise one; it is Haydn-esque, and granted it to be by Beethoven, that would not surprise one; there is not from beginning to end a Beethoven touch, a hint of the earlier or later Beethoven feeling, a suggestion of the composer who at the age of twenty was "all for the sublime" and is reported (apocryphally, I think) to have provoked Mozart to foretell his future greatness, and this does surprise one, and when it has ceased to surprise it renders one absolutely sceptical. I am not going to discuss the symphony in detail: it is not worth it. But it is worth dealing with the contentions of Mr. Landon Ronald's programme-maker. He says the orchestral parts evidently date from the close of the eighteenth century: at the close of the eighteenth century Beethoven was thirty years old, was well known, and had composed some master-works. Again, the programme-maker says "the symphony possesses an evolutionary interest and significance as a predecessor—a study in fact—of the hitherto so-called first symphony": even were it a predecessor it is not in the least like a study; or if it is a study, it is a study by someone who was not Beethoven for some symphony Beethoven never wrote. "Evidence has been adduced that Beethoven actually did send certain of his Bonn compositions to Jena for consideration and examination." If that is so, where are the others; and, as already remarked, why did Beethoven send parts and not scores; or, if he sent scores, is it not odd that they should be lost while the parts are preserved? In 1788 Beethoven paid an important visit to Vienna. After that he could no longer be considered a provincial musician who was likely to send his works to Jena to be tried. "No other composer of that particular period can be regarded as capable of having written the work." Mozart and Haydn were both alive. Was neither of these giants capable "of having written" this trivial bit of commonplace? Professor Stein of Jena has by his discovery called attention to a hitherto unknown gentleman, Professor Stein of Jena. Let him rest

content. The more he seeks to prove now, the greater damage he will do to his own case.

As for Mr. Ronald, whether he is going about like a cat bereft of her young, or moping like a bird whose nest has been robbed, or posing as one of those pioneers of science who know the earth to be flat with the sun and the stars going round it, let him, too, be content. He was right to play the thing: he has enabled us to judge for ourselves. He was more especially right to give it in magnificent style and so make the most of Professor Stein's case. With this my interest in the matter ends. Something ought now to be said about a series of fine concerts which I have shamefully neglected. The new Symphony orchestra seems to have established itself in London favour, and the policy of lowering the prices has been justified. The only fault I have to find is that there are not enough concerts. Four in the course of the winter season are not enough. I believe one a week would prove profitable; and two other excellent institutions, the Symphony orchestra and the Queen's Hall orchestra, would be forced by the competition to reduce their prices also. Both would benefit, and one would no longer be depressed by the barren acreage of the stalls and frequently the sparsely populated gallery. On 30 March the familiar *præludium* of Jarnafelt was given; then after the Jena concoction a double piano concerto by Mozart was played by the Misses Satz. They are evidently very talented young women; but the work requires rather grace and lightness of finger than strength and sheer virtuosity, and before venturing to suggest a place for them in the piano-playing world I shall have to hear them again. I don't know that the policy of playing always in pairs is a wise one. One piano is very like another piano; and antiphonal passages which look effective in the score rarely produce any effect in performance. The band accompanied sympathetically and neatly, and nothing more was called for. The E minor symphony of Tchaikowsky did not strike me as worth waiting to hear. Musco music has long been wearisome to me, and of late the E minor has been as much overdone as was the B minor a few years ago. The B minor still figures frequently in orchestral programmes, and to ask us to put up with the E minor in addition is to ask just a little too much. Are conductors a flock of sheep that must follow the one who gets away first? Is it in a spirit of rivalry that if one makes a hit with his rendering of a particular work another must try to show how much better he can do it? It is odd that we should everlastingly find them playing a particular work about the same time. It is of no special interest to me that Nikisch gets these effects and Sir Henry Wood those: these twiddling little points neither make nor mar great playing on the orchestra. Anyhow, Tchaikowsky does not wear well for those games to be tried on with him; and I make a piteous appeal to Messrs. Ronald, Wood, Nikisch and Co. to stop it.

A HOUSE IN ANGLESEA.

By FILSON YOUNG.

IF you would discover the character of a house you should approach it first at night through a country which is unfamiliar to you. You will thus learn it from the inside and not from the outside; you will wake up in it, and see it first in daylight when you walk out of its own door; and its world will dawn upon you in a natural way, as it would dawn upon a child who had been born within its walls. I saw this house first on an April night of storm, after a long journey in the train whose chief business it is to carry travellers on their way to Ireland. The lights on the mail steamer, as we drew up beside her, shone hospitably enough; but the gale was already strumming a tune on her rigging, and I knew that for all she lay so quiet and motionless in the shelter of the harbour, in ten minutes she would be plunging and nosing into the stiff seas, and her decks would be wet with cold spray.

It was a good night not to be going to sea; and I was glad to leave the bustle of the

harbour behind me and speed inland along the pale empty roads, and exchange the strong salt air of the harbour for the earthy perfumes of the spring night. We skimmed along lonely roads that turned off into lonelier. It was so strange to me not to be going on to Ireland that my consciousness was divided; half of it was on the steamer, and half in this remote and unknown country, travelling farther away from the wind and the sea. The contrast between these two halves of a divided consciousness grew momentarily greater; and just as one half was well out in the heavy seas off the South Stack, listening to the high chanting of the wind against the ship, the other turned a corner into the shelter of a beech wood carpeted with primroses; and by a road of daffodils, and through the silence of a garden, came into the golden lamplight of the doorway. I left the other half to disappear over the horizon of the dark seas, and surrendered myself to the half that had lost itself in this new world. For I had no geography or road lore to guide me; I only knew that my way had lain through the country of the April night, by a road of daffodils, through a wood of primroses, to the garden and the house of my friends. And the next morning, like one that has been born again, I walked out into the world to learn what it was like.

The house is of the dark grey colour of the rocky country, and lies so close under the hill that it might have been carved out of it. It is a very hidden house; even by day you only see it when you are well within its own demesne. The beech wood veils it in front—a beech wood of grey stems and branches all tipped with brown, a roof all brushed into parallel lines by the prevailing wind, and a floor that was hesitating in texture and colour between the primroses that were going and the bluebells that were coming. All the land about the house, rising to a height on one side and falling to a hollow on the other, has become a garden, not by the apparent brute force of gardeners, but as though loving and skilful hands had helped the earth in what she wanted to do, and assisted the flowers in their games. Where the primroses wanted to be, there was a primrose garden; where plants that loved the marsh had gathered, plants that loved the marsh were protected; up on the croft where the gorse was, the world was given over to the green and gold of gorse and grass; and where the roses had found a paradise of sun and soil and shelter, one would find in summer a paradise of roses. And from the fields behind the house, where the ponies sunned themselves in the lee of a rock, you looked down upon a long lake that might have been an arm of the sea, with little rocky forelands and green shores beyond where the lambs were cropping the sweet grass.

The house itself, of every period and no period, a thing that has grown naturally to meet the needs of those who have lived in it, has an air of secret and mysterious peace. For many years it slept uninhabited, and no doubt in that time, driven in upon itself, acquired the store of individuality which it seems to possess. Some houses are obviously the expression of those who live in them, mere appendages to the family. Others dominate those who inhabit them, imparting their own character to the generations that come and go, so that the people who live in them seem to be mere products and offspring of the brick and stone. Some houses are tame and highly domesticated, and will adapt themselves to the most complicated and civilised of human wants; others, of an older period, are savage and unaccommodating, so that it is dangerous to tamper with them and impossible to adapt them; and in the draughts from their wide chimneys, and the chill of their vast chambers, and the gloom of their halls lighted through narrow slits in the thick walls, the family shivers out an existence at variance with its environment. But this house, although it has a personality entirely of its own, is friendly and accommodating to those whom it shelters. It is like something pagan and wild, some creature of another time that its owners came quietly upon in its sleep and made friends with. This is not a case of the people belonging to the house or the house to the people, so much as the house and the people living together

in harmonious amity, furthering each other's purposes. The house has sheltered the human lives that have grown up there, and the little feet that have pattered in the footprints of Druids and Roman soldiers have grown firm and steady in their steps on the great paths of life; and in return, human hands have cared for the house and the land, and fashioned human lives there without disturbing the pagan spirit that lurks by every rock, in every primrose path, and in every ripple of the silent lake.

As when a traveller gets farther from a piece of country he loses the details and sees more clearly the formation of the whole as it shrinks in perspective; so, as one gets farther away from anything, one loses the grasp of one component quality after another, until only the essential quality remains. Holyhead with its masts and feathers of steam disappears below the horizon; Anglesea, from being a continent, becomes an island, and Wales, from being a world, becomes a slice on the edge of England with Anglesea merely a little piece of it that has been broken off the corner and joined on again. And somewhere in Anglesea, between the beech wood and a hill crowned with a wilderness of gorse, with a warren sloping up on one side and a lake lying still and secret in the fold beneath, there is this dark grey house, occupying through all seasons and weathers this piece of pagan territory. And as this site has been preserved as a dwelling-place of man from time immemorial, so it has come to preserve in itself a quality as of truce and agreement between earth and man; the place where they have come to terms, and established a reign of peace.

DIVINITY AT OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE.

I.

THE "NATIONALISATION" OF OXFORD DIVINITY.

By DOUGLAS MACLEANE.

THE question of throwing open University degrees and examinations in Divinity has arisen simultaneously at Durham, Cambridge, and Oxford, but it is at Oxford that the qualifications are most restrictive, and where the difficulty of maintaining the status quo is accordingly most obvious. Also, Oxford is more peculiarly a cosmopolis of all peoples, nations, and tongues, a home of every kind of faith and nonconformity. Beyond the Indian Institute stands a group of important modern buildings, chiefly Congregationalist and Unitarian, while the Roman Catholic authorities have definitely decided that the pros of sending their young students to Oxford outweigh the cons, and have established several very able teachers and highly efficient hostels amid the academic groves. The religion of the University, however, is still officially Anglican. The Chairs of Theology, the examinations in Divinity, whether honour or pass, can only be held by priests of the Church of England, and the same restriction applies to attainment of the degrees of B.D. and D.D., though any undergraduate, whatever his creed, can obtain the degrees in Arts through the avenue of the Theology School. It is now proposed to throw open absolutely the examinations and Divinity degrees. General opinion among resident Churchmen, though at first hesitating, is said now to favour the change, or at least to regard it as inevitable. It seems to be agreed that no appeal will be made to the Greater Oxford of non-residents to come up to vote against it, and indeed the summoning of the Masters—composed, for the most part, of London laymen, but conventionally supposed to be all poor and illiterate country parsons—is an invidious step which should only be resorted to in the vital crises.

The present is, as I hope to show, a very vital crisis, yet a non-resident is hardly in a position to combat the evident opinion of the men on the spot that the present restrictions cannot any longer be maintained. The onlooker may be able, however, to see the full issues and bearings of the proposed great change better than those who are too close to practical and immediate considerations to pay much attention to

ultimate consequences and principles. We shall be told that the abolition of the existing qualifications will not for some time make much appreciable difference. An attempt may even be made—except that it would be disingenuous—to represent the question as merely one about the eligibility of Churchmen who do not happen to be clerics. This aversion from large views is what makes the English so unconsciously revolutionary. If they were abolishing altar and throne, they would very likely do it in a sub-section of a Turnpike Bill.

The actual question about these degrees and examinations is whether the School of Theology is to retain henceforward any necessary connexion with the Christian religion. Put in another way it is this, whether the study of Theology shall not be discontinued, and an entirely different thing, the Comparative Science of Religious Ideas, put in its place. Yet there is no widespread animus against either Christianity or Theology. Nor is there even any particular anti-clerical feeling at work. What is bringing about this great change is simply the logic of circumstances. The doors of the University have been thrown open to all comers. There is a large non-Christian element either Oriental or agnostic, among the elder and younger students, who include also many Protestant Dissenters and a certain number of Roman Catholics. Some of these non-Anglicans—to group them conveniently under one head—are at Oxford for theological study, and would like to take Divinity degrees. There are big institutes for post-graduate Divinity students, and very capable divines preside over them. Now all this was not foreseen by the Liberal reformers of thirty and sixty years ago, many of whom were Bishops and Deans. What they desired was, not the flooding of the Universities with people of every denomination, but their clericalisation. Nor were the Protestant Dissenters at all anxious to come. They feared the Anglican atmosphere, and the "Edinburgh Review" reminded them that at the door at which they entered Rome must enter too. The prediction of the Commissioners, however, that the non-Churchmen "could never be a large number", has in course of time been completely falsified. The cuckoo has grown very much, and has specialised in Divinity. It is very creditable to Mansfield, for instance, that in the last twenty years thirty-nine of its students have won University prizes in Theology, though these figures also testify to the fairness with which the Church has treated her rivals. And now the Church, or rather the Christian religion, has notice to quit. The forces of undenominationalism are energetic and pushing, and are content that Theology should be de-Christianised so long as they themselves can assert equality with the Church. And resident Churchmen are paralysed with uncertainty whether the Church has any right to defend its privileges. The Theology School was assigned to the Church of England as a sort of reserve, in compensation for her great disestablishment in the Universities. But Incas, Red Indians, and other aboriginal possessors of the soil tend inevitably to be more and more displaced by the new-comers, and having once admitted the outside world, the University is bound bit by bit to grant the principle of absolute religious equality. Oxford Conservatives are dissatisfied with the way in which the movement has been worked by the Seven Professors, who seem to have acted without consultation with the Theology tutors. But it is best to waive all such side issues and concentrate attention on what is logically and practically involved in "religious equality".

The admission of non-Churchmen to Divinity degrees is comparatively a much less grave question than their appointment as examiners. It certainly seems hard to refuse the right of proceeding B.D. and D.D. to any meritorious theological student. Yet it must be pointed out with energetic insistence that the enlargement cannot and shall not be confined to a few Protestant Dissenting ministers, but must include every form of creed and anti-creed. A Parsee will be eligible for the Divinity doctorate, and if a Unitarian sends in an able

and learned thesis to prove our Lord to have been mere man, or a New Theologian one to demonstrate the imperfection of His character, or an atheist one to show that God has no existence, the Regius Professor will be bound to present him for the dignity and degree of *Sacrae Theologiae* Professor. That is incontrovertible.

This, however, will not very often happen. What is of far greater consequence is the necessary severance of the School of Theology from all Christian presupposition. Let this result of the present movement be courageously and honestly faced. The matter has been represented as merely an awarding of examination marks for knowledge rather than for opinion. But that is not the point at all. Under the existing conditions of the examinations in Theology no undergraduate is in any way penalised for his beliefs. Great care is taken to avoid controversial subjects in setting the questions, and to elicit knowledge rather than opinion. Nevertheless the School is one of "Sacred Theology", and its whole background is based on the assumption of the truth of the Christian revelation. The University statutes speak of "dogmatica" and "symbolica", of "Holy" Scriptures and "Holy" Gospels. The basis of the School is that of historic Christianity. But how can that continue to be its basis when persons of all faiths and unfaiths may be among the examiners, and the equality of all creeds is the avowed principle on which the School is based? No doubt for some time University theology will in practice be vaguely Christian. But as long as it is so it will be a dishonest sham, and an injustice to non-Christians. The subject-matter will not be Theology—which means in Christian mouths the elucidation of a Divine deposit of faith—but the investigation of the phenomena of religious opinions in all ages and climes, between which the University, whose motto is still "*Dominus Illuminatio Mea*", will stand coldly neutral. The faith of the Gospel will stand on the same level as the worship of cats and onions. Oh, but it will not so come about, they say. But if not, why not? Surely we are not being deliberately invited to establish a bogus unreality, a new inequality, and merely to give undenominationalism a fresh triumph and a permanent footing.

Of course the Divinity Chairs must be "nationalised" also. I do not think Churchmen will raise a finger to defend them when the time comes. They will be an indefensible abuse and anomaly. Why should an eminent Jesuit or Jew be forbidden hereafter to become Regius or Margaret Professor of Divinity, Professor of Ecclesiastical History, or of Hebrew? There is an erudite Unitarian at Oxford who is supposed to aspire to a Divinity Professorship, and the only argument for keeping him out is that the curve of professorial teaching ought to pass through certain fixed points of Nicene orthodoxy—though it is in practice quite free. But how can that principle be defended as regards Professorships when it has been surrendered everywhere else? The difficulty that several Chairs are attached to canons and in that way endowed is a last trench which can easily be rushed. It is sometimes suggested that the University should endow new Professorships, freed from all conditions of belief, but such a dual system is hardly workable. In the same way the alternative plan of Concurrent Faculties is scarcely likely to be adopted. We cannot in England divide confessions into Catholic and Protestant, though it is practically done in the University local examinations. Yet this difficulty might be got over if the non-Churchmen were willing. But they are fixedly opposed to the recognition of denominationalism in any shape.

After the sweeping changes brought about by the University Commissions, the Church of England, "*indocilis pauperiem pati*", set about refitting her shattered argosies. New foundations were started, and a spirit of efficiency was breathed into what was left of the old machinery. It would seem that the work will have to be done all over again. The most satisfactory plan would be for the University to cease to recognise *Sacra Theologia* altogether and drop the Divinity degrees, while granting a certificate for proficiency in

the study of religious documents, among which those of the Bible would have no preference over the Koran or the Rig-vedas. If we are to be fair to all, this is the only way. Of course the University would cease to be officially Christian, but that is now inevitable. Let us look facts in the face.

II.

THE DECADENCE OF CAMBRIDGE THEOLOGY.

By ARCHDEACON CUNNINGHAM.

THE proposal to throw open Divinity Degrees to laymen shows what a change has taken place in the position and character of theological studies since the early 'seventies. At that time academic teaching was a powerful religious influence in the University, whereas in the present day it has practically ceased to count. There is an intense interest in religious matters among the young men who come up from Christian homes and schools, and find themselves in an unaccustomed atmosphere. The Student Christian movement has had a cordial welcome, and on the other hand the assaults on Christianity, by leading men of great ability, are more open and violent than they have ever been before. In all this ferment of religious discussion the official representation of Christianity seems to have no place; it stands entirely aloof. This is chiefly because of the mode of treatment which has come into vogue. Theology used to be presented as a doctrine of life—of Divine life working in and through men; it has come to be treated as an academic discussion of documents.

The steps in the decline have been clearly marked by successive restrictions in the scope of the subject, as recognised by the University. In the early 'seventies Professor F. D. Maurice was lecturing on questions of practical morality from a Christian standpoint. His published course on "Social Morality" is well worth reading in connexion with the widespread unrest and social disintegration of the present day; but the University has deliberately ceased to make provision for any teaching of the kind. When the Commission of 1877 was sitting, it was rightly felt to be absurd that Henry Sidgwick should be excluded from the only professorship of Ethics in the University. It would have been most desirable to start a new chair of moral philosophy which would have derived dignity and importance from the eminence of the first professor; but the Commission decided instead that the Knightbridge foundation should be changed from a theological to a philosophical professorship. The University has in consequence withdrawn from any attempt to provide for the discussion of questions of practical morality from the Christian point of view, and the scope of official Christian teaching has been regrettably restricted.

The tendency to narrow the scope of theological study has been partly due to another influence, which has operated gradually but effectively. During the latter half of last century Cambridge was obsessed by a superstitious belief in competitive examination, as a means of promoting accurate and thorough study; and a Theological Tripos was instituted in the hope of stimulating those who were engaged in reading sacred literature. The late Dr. Hort foresaw and protested against the probable result of these "mischievous" proposals. "For the first time", he wrote, "theology has consented to be ranged simply as one of the accredited sciences of the University. It is placed on the same footing as political economy or mineralogy. It is especially exposed to the danger of assuming a narrow and technical character." So long as the new examination was only open to those who had already graduated in Arts, its effect was comparatively slight; but after 1874, when the new Tripos was accepted as qualifying for a B.A. degree with honours, the theological reading of a large number of the best students came to be confined within the limits of an examination schedule. All subjects lose something when freedom of treatment is confined by the exigencies of examination, but some suffer more than others. Mathematical and philological subjects lend themselves easily

to the application of the examination test, but its inadequacy in other branches of learning is notorious. Written answers have to be supplemented by practical work in some of the natural sciences, and written examination is specially inappropriate to testing knowledge of the nature and influence of spiritual forces. The dominance of the examination system in the organisation of theological reading led inevitably to an undue prominence being given to those branches of study which can be conveniently tested by written papers. Christian theology—the systematic presentation of eternal truth revealed to man—does not adapt itself readily to examination purposes, and in preparation for the new Tripos any distinctively Christian teaching or belief was deliberately left on one side. It has been maintained that, since the passing of the Test Act, an equal chance in an academic race must be given to all the candidates, in whatever religion they had been brought up; and hence the study of theology has been carried on at Cambridge with the Christianity left out. Little attempt has been made to help the men who are reading theology to realise the full significance of Christianity as a philosophy of life, or to keep it before them as a trustworthy guide in all the babble of modern discussions and controversy.

A very serious result of the dominance of examination over sacred studies at Cambridge arises from the habits which tend to form themselves in the student's mind. Preparation for examination is an intellectual exercise, and as such it is non-religious; whether it has any religious character or not will depend entirely on personal temperament. There is at present, in many quarters, a strong feeling that it is undesirable to pursue sacred studies in this non-religious spirit; this is the issue which underlies the burning controversy in regard to elementary education; and the pupils from some secondary schools are discouraged by their teachers from offering Scripture subjects in the Oxford and Cambridge examinations, so that the lessons may be not merely intellectual exercises, but may have a religious character. There has been no similar hesitation in Cambridge since the Theological Tripos came to dominate theological reading. The habit of devoting the mind to sacred subjects, as a mere intellectual exercise, and in a non-religious spirit, has been fostered. This non-religious habit of mind in regard to the study of spiritual realities may come to be deficient in reverence, and it has an affinity with the irreligious treatment of sacred subjects.

The professoriate as a body could hardly escape from being affected by the conditions created by the dominance of the examination system. The lectures which elicit most response in Cambridge, and which are sure to attract a class, are those which have a direct bearing on preparation for the Tripos. By a sort of perverse conscientiousness there has come to be a dangerous dichotomy between official activities and personal life. There seems to be a feeling that official duties ought to be done in a non-religious fashion, and that the personal religious life is independent and distinct. Whatever truth there may be in this contention, it does not hold good for personal religious influence. According to popular opinion, religion ought to influence a man's whole life, and all his activities. The assumption that his personal religious life will affect the manner in which he discharges his official duties underlies the wish to retain a religious test for professorships. Nor is the new and strained view of official duty a passing phase. The narrow treatment of theological subjects, which has been induced by the dominance of examination influence, is likely to perpetuate itself. The professoriate will naturally be recruited from Theological Tripos men who have been habituated to the non-religious study of sacred books, and who have neither the capacity nor the desire to go beyond the groove of intellectual interest in which they themselves attained distinction.

The movement for opening degrees to laymen will have had a useful result if it renders the religious public aware of the extent to which the de-Christianising of the University of Cambridge has already proceeded. The

proposal of the Council that Degrees in Divinity shall henceforth be awarded irrespective of belief or disbelief in Christianity is the logical outcome of the practice, which has become usual under Tripos influence, of reading theological subjects in a non-religious frame of mind. The University already encourages the pursuit of critical studies and research in Biblical Science, without raising any question of personal opinions. The Senate is now being asked to decide whether the official recognition of the study of Christianity, as a body of revealed truth and a guide in the perplexities of life, shall be altogether withdrawn.

CORRESPONDENCE.

PRESENT-DAY ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL LAW.

To the Editor of the SATURDAY REVIEW.

25 Wood Street, Bolton.
8 April 1912.

SIR,—May I say how entirely I concur in the views expressed in your article of Saturday last on this subject? In 1897 I read a paper before the Incorporated Law Society on "The Non-competency of Prisoners as Witnesses—an Essential and Beneficial Feature of our Criminal Law". It was directed against the Bill which, unfortunately in my judgment, became law in 1898. I pointed out that the improvement in criminal law administration during the last three or four hundred years had for its keynote the better securing to prisoners of a trial hedged round with every possible defence, not only against prejudice and oppression, but also against any semblance of hostility in act, motion, or feeling towards the accused.

The great fundamental maxim—the golden rule as I do not hesitate to call it—upon which our criminal administration had hitherto been conducted, was that the accused was to be presumed innocent until he had been found guilty, and it was the working out of this great maxim which gave to the criminal tribunals in England a grandeur and dignity which nothing else could bestow.

By the proposed alteration of the law, which would make the prisoner a competent witness on his own behalf, I submitted that the whole aspect of a criminal trial would be revolutionised, and I venture to say that every year of the working of the Act of 1898 has strengthened the force of this contention.

Instead of the prosecution being content dispassionately to lay before the Court and jury the facts as they can be proved, and to produce a close chain of convincing testimony, the power to cross-examine the prisoner, and to patch up a weak case out of his own mouth, whether it be from his confusion of facts and from his falling ignorantly into unwise admissions, or into any other trap which the ingenuity of counsel may lay for him, has changed what was formerly merely a desire to sift the facts in order to find the guilty person into a determination to win, if possible, or in other words to convict. I would not for a moment suggest that any undue advantage is, or is even desired to be, taken of a prisoner, but I urge that it is the grave defect of the present procedure that it must and does lend itself to this change of relations of the prosecution as regards the prisoner, and to his great disadvantage. With regard to the cross-examination of prisoners by the judges, I most earnestly regret that such an obligation should ever be thrown upon them.

I venture also to say (with all respect) that the practice which found favour with the judicial bench, forty or fifty years ago, of hearing cases, whether criminal or civil, with practically little comment or interruption until the time for summing-up came, seems to me to have had much in its favour.

As to the power of the accused to say, like the negro prisoner when asked to take the witness-chair, "I guess, Judge, I'll remain neutral", it will, I think, be generally agreed that this will always mean taking the risk of creating a strong prejudice by his refusal.

Is it too late to hope for a return to the well-trying procedure of former days, and let the prisoner at the bar again feel assured that the one and only aim which is animating the prosecution and all concerned in the trial is not a desire to find him guilty, but to discover the truth, and bring home the crime to the person who has really committed it?

Yours obediently,
W. P. FULLAGAR.

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE TO-DAY.

To the Editor of the SATURDAY REVIEW.

143 Cannon Street E.C.,
10 April 1912.

SIR,—I have read with great interest your article "The Seddon Case", and also the very able contribution by Mr. Filson Young. While you are dealing with Criminal Court procedure, and the prevailing methods of our judges, may I be allowed to comment upon a matter which seems to have some connexion with the subject?

It does seem a little strange, does it not, that so many of our judges should now consider it incumbent upon them to assure the prisoner about to be convicted that he has received "a very fair trial"? Surely this is to be taken for granted! If a prisoner is justly convicted, it is quite unnecessary; on the other hand, the man conscious of his own innocence must be imbued with a certain amount of stoicism to appreciate the consolation offered. In either case it is a poor excuse for hanging a man. We read such statements with scepticism, remembering a certain French proverb which speaks of excuses and self-accusation as being analogous.

I am, Sir, yours sincerely,
G. H. SUTHERLAND.

THE COMMONS' SHILLING DINNER.

To the Editor of the SATURDAY REVIEW.

Hôtel Athénée, Paris.
6 April 1912.

SIR,—Apropos of your comments upon the shilling dinner provided for members at the Commons' Restaurant, will you allow me to say that anyone who pays that sum for that dinner as a rule gives full value for the article served, and the service, which is extra.

A really good simple dinner properly cooked and properly served should be provided—and not a shilling but a fair price should and would be paid for it.

A MEMBER WHO AVOIDS THE SHILLING DINNER.

THE KEY TO POLONIUS' WISDOM.

To the Editor of the SATURDAY REVIEW.

Everton, Bawtry, Yorkshire,
2 April 1912.

SIR,—Shakespearean commentators have wasted a great deal of paper in trying to prove that Polonius was not intended to act and talk like a dotard. They try to explain away Hamlet's remarks—"These tedious old fools"; "Follow that lord, and look you mock him not" etc.—and rely on the famous precepts to prove their case. If Polonius could rightly claim the precepts as his own, no doubt the commentators could make out their case; but, as though he had foreseen their mistakes, Shakespeare has indicated plainly that they were not original.

What really happened, at the end of Laertes' parting interview with his sister, was this. Polonius, coming upon the scene, remembers something that he forgot when he previously said farewell to his son. He pulls from his pocket a book of maxims: "a cento of quotations from Lyly's 'Euphues'" as Professor Dowden says. From that book he proceeds to read. He values the book too highly to be willing to part with it, and

therefore he counsels his son to print these weighty maxims in his mind:

"These few precepts in thy memory
See thou character."

Just as the book had the printed characters, so must Laertes' mind carry in it memorised characters. The choice of that particular word is as explicit as if Shakespeare had left the stage direction "Polonius pulls at a book and reads aloud". Since the precepts are to be credited to the writer of the book, there is no necessity to enter into long and entirely unconvincing attempts to prove that the maxims were the invention of "this tedious old fool" or that Polonius "was but mad north-north-west".

Yours etc.,
THOMAS H. BRETNALL.

FRENCH AND ENGLISH LAUGHTER.

To the Editor of the SATURDAY REVIEW.

London, 10 April 1912.

SIR,—M. l'Abbé Ernest Dimnet invites me to a controversy. I shall not accept the invitation; for, once engaged, who could foresee the end? The extent of a controversy upon so tremendous a theme would only be limited by the respective erudition, combativeness, and staying-power of the parties engaged. Besides, I should almost certainly get the worst of it. I admit quite frankly that I have done a foolish thing. Anyone who generalises on so complex and boundless a subject as a nation's laughter or a nation's temperament puts himself more or less at the mercy of the critic whom his generalisation fails to satisfy. In literature, at any rate, the exceptions prove that there never is a rule; and most general statements are of more value for the exceptions they suggest than for the examples they include. The Abbé's article is proof of this. I do not regard it as destructive of mine, which provoked it. Rather it is complementary. I absolutely refuse to quarrel. For one thing, it has just occurred to me that M. l'Abbé, being provoked by me in the first instance, has the choice of weapon. He would probably compel me to fight him in French. Once more, I absolutely refuse.

Nevertheless, the French people has never understood Shakespeare. I am not arguing from the fact that Voltaire called him a drunken savage, or that Boileau would probably have fainted outright at a production of Macbeth. We ourselves, in the days of Dr. Johnson, were quite as unaware and as supercilious of Shakespeare's riches as Voltaire or Prévost; and no Frenchman ever maltreated him so thoroughly as David Garrick. These things, on both sides of the Channel, were more faults of the age than of the people.

It was not in the days of Voltaire, but of Hugo, that the French showed conclusively that, so far as any gulf can be said to exist between peoples and literature, that gulf existed between Shakespeare and themselves. It was when Hugo began to imitate Shakespeare, and when La Place and Le Tourneur began to translate and adapt him, that the true nature and extent of the racial difficulty was perceived.

Yours faithfully,
JOHN PALMER.

ANGELS IN SCULPTURE.

To the Editor of the SATURDAY REVIEW.

Windlestone, Ferry Hill.
9 April 1912.

SIR,—I agree with your correspondent re the proposed King Edward Memorial in Piccadilly, but I think he has missed one important advantage that might come from it—namely, that it may serve in some measure to hide the abomination which is opposite Buckingham Palace. Otherwise we must, I suppose, wait on the mercy of the growing trees.

Surely we are satiated with memorials crowned by angels. And why angels? There is only one beautiful angel in sculpture, at any rate that I know of, and

that is the Niké of Samothrace in the Louvre. These modern angels, with their laurels and their palms and their offensive, domineering superior attitude, are dreadful people.

A friend of mine, who is also an artist, once told me that the reason why angels are always a failure in art is that they are taken from women, and no woman can ever be an angel. A griffin on the other hand is quite a better affair. I can think of no one even in history wicked enough to deserve the penalty of an in memoriam angel—much less should it be placed on a monument to record the merits of our good King Edward VII.

I am, yours faithfully,
WILLIAM EDEN.

HEXAMETERS OF THE AUTHORISED VERSION.

To the Editor of the SATURDAY REVIEW.

H.M.S. "Blanche", Home Fleet,
7 April 1912.

SIR,—You have not exhausted the list. The following have occurred to me in ten minutes, after not thinking of the subject for twenty-eight years, a rather striking instance of subconscious memory:

"Cry aloud, spare not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet."

"And it shall come to pass that before they call I will answer."

And the couplet:

"Thus saith the Lord, Where is the bill of thy mother's divorcement?
Whom I have put away, or which of my creditors is it."

Yours obediently,
G. M. MARSTON.

To the Editor of the SATURDAY REVIEW.

9 April 1912.

SIR,—In your current issue containing the interesting article on the Hexameters of the Authorised Version, I notice that the following verse in S. Paul's Epistle to the Colossians, chap. iii. 19, is not mentioned:

"Husbands, love your wives, and be not bitter against them."

I remember in 1849 this used to be given to the boys—I think by the Surmaster of S. Paul's School, John Phillips Bean—as a typical instance of an Hexameter occurring in the New Testament.

I am, Sir, yours obediently,
W. W.

To the Editor of the SATURDAY REVIEW.

Dumfries, Easter Day.

SIR,—I was interested in reading your article on the Hexameters of the Authorised Version. It is a curious coincidence that the opening sentence of the SATURDAY REVIEW in which this article appears is a perfect Hexameter: "Easter does not bring the industrial peace we had hoped for".

Yours truly,
A CONSTANT READER.

APPLAUSE AT CONCERTS.

To the Editor of the SATURDAY REVIEW.

The Hall, Hurworth-on-Tees, Darlington,
22 March 1912.

SIR,—I think it is time that someone should protest against the habit of clapping at the wrong moment at concerts. A performance of Bach's B mi. Mass affords an instance of this. It must be most annoying and disturbing for the performers, as well as for the right-minded portion of the audience, when music of this nature is interrupted by applause after each section.

I venture to suggest a simple remedy. At the Promenade Concerts we are "politely requested to refrain from striking matches", etc., by a note on the programme. Could not similar precautions be taken in this sort of case, where silence is so desirable until the end of the work performed?

Yours faithfully,
D. L. FORBES.

"BADAJOZ 1812."

To the Editor of the SATURDAY REVIEW.

Deerswell, Paignton, South Devon.
6 April 1912.

SIR,—In the midst of our strike "wars", our Dis-establishment "campaigns", and other misnomers, it is not a little refreshing, by the light of Colonel Verner's article, to cast an eye back to last night one hundred years ago, and see what certain Englishmen were doing. Then it was war—not the war of words, nor even of beer-bottles. We had then an enemy worthy of the name, and we dealt with him. The same regiments, now designedly disguised under other appellations as if in shame of former deeds, do indeed exist; and, in them, men ready as ever to do and dare; but who, outside the Army itself, can recognise them? The process of confounding confusion goes on as if honour and prestige were no factors in the moulding of the fighting man.

Badajoz was stormed in 1812. In 1848 the survivors of that and many contemporary actions, and of the interim years, received the Peninsula medal, and held themselves rewarded.

Yours truly,
MORRIS BENT (Major, ret.).

A COPIOUS FOUNTAIN OF HONOUR.

To the Editor of the SATURDAY REVIEW.

92 Victoria Street, Westminster S.W.

SIR,—There is a very amusing and illuminating discovery which reveals itself to anyone who carefully reads the Reports of Royal Commissions on Vivisection. The ingenious student is quickly forced to observe that of those who gave evidence in support of the horrid practice of vivisection few have escaped some appropriate decoration.

Mr. W. H. Power, who came before the Commission in 1907 to defend vivisection, was duly knighted in the following year.

Mr. Henry Morris, who gave evidence against us in May 1907, and came before the Commission to urge that the absurd Act of 1876 "is sufficient protection against any abuse of vivisection", was promptly made a Baronet in 1909, but as he was President of the Royal College of Surgeons his decoration may not be due solely to his services to vivisection.

Mr. H. R. Swanzy came over from Ireland in January 1907 to urge upon the Commission the desirability of permitting vivisection of animals merely for the purpose of acquiring manual skill, and although the Commissioners entirely repudiated any such enlargement of the powers of vivisection, Mr. Swanzy had hardly left the witness chair before he was made Sir Henry Swanzy.

In November 1907 Colonel Bruce, who is a bacteriologist, came to say that he had stopped Malta fever by telling the soldiers not to drink goats' milk, and that he had not inflicted anything more painful on animals than needle pricks, "drawing blood, feeding experiments and so forth", but he represented something called the "Committee of Medical and Scientific Societies" and was sufficiently pro-vivisection in his evidence to secure a knighthood shortly after.

Mr. W. Osler came in November 1907 to say that he agreed with the evidence of Professor Starling, who in his précis said that "men who put everything second to the pursuit of knowledge were a great asset to a nation". Such whole-hog support of the vivisectionists was recognised by a baronetcy; a knighthood would hardly have met the case.

Dr. Rose Bradford came as one of the twenty-one vivisectors licensed to pursue the detestable practice at University College, Gower Street, and to say that he thought he was in favour of doing away with all certificates for persons who were in the position of head of a laboratory. This precious suggestion was taken no notice of by the Commissioners in their Report, but as a solatium for this snub a K.C.M.G. was promptly conferred upon him.

Mr. Byrne came from the Home Office to defend himself, his colleagues, and his permanent chief Sir Mackenzie Chalmers, for administering the Act for thirty years in the manner I have described in my charges, and such services to vivisection have been fitly recognised by a K.C.V.O.

Mr. Chalmers, who as a Commissioner occupied the egregious position of being a judge of his own conduct at the Home Office, which was under review, received a K.C.B. immediately after he was appointed to this equivocal situation as a sort of anticipatory fortification and prophetic acquittal. Judgment first, evidence afterwards.

The witnesses on the other side have all successfully escaped the smallest drops of moisture from the fountain of honour which has been played on these supporters of vivisection like a fire-hose.

I cannot help hoping that the case of the laboratory boy who gallantly came to the rescue of Dr. Gaskell and was affectionately addressed by him as "William" will not be overlooked. He seems to have been forgotten in the general cascade. Let us hope that when the next batch of vivisectors is selected for decoration he will receive his well-earned M.V.O.

In the meanwhile, Dr. Gaskell might do a graceful act by requesting the Research Defence Society to make the ingenuous "William" a Vice-President.

Your obedient servant,
STEPHEN COLERIDGE.

GERMANY AND THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

To the Editor of the SATURDAY REVIEW.

China, 4 March 1912.

SIR,—It sometimes happens that an observer living beyond the fringe of the Empire has a clearer vision on certain international questions than others residing at home. One of your correspondents the other week hinted at what has long been a settled conviction of mine, that the Anglo-German difficulty does not lie so much in the North Sea as in the South Atlantic. Those who know the Teuton abroad realise the utter futility of "bottling him up"—he must have expansion and he will get it, do what you may. The German Emperor was quite sincere when he declared that the German Navy was not directed against England—that is not primarily, but we have fallen into the unfortunate habit of pulling the chestnuts out of the fire for the United States. What lies between Germany and her dreams of expansion is the Monroe doctrine; and Americans are counting on the British Navy to keep the Kaiser's fleet off the rich republics of South America which he covets. Why should we stand in Germany's light as long as she undertakes to respect our extensive rights and privileges in those regions? Why should the British taxpayer be burdened to uphold the sentiments of our Transatlantic cousins? During the Spanish-American war Britain foiled German designs; was this wise? An American orator touring the Far East soon after the war, made statements in his public lectures which were flattering to British vanity but very humiliating to the Germans out here. Somebody must pay the piper. Surely the time has come to make our European neighbour understand that the Monroe doctrine is no affair of ours; and if the undeveloped and incalculably rich lands of South America offer themselves as a safety valve to her crowded millions, we certainly should not hinder Germany from taking her "place in the sun".

Yours faithfully,
H. LECHMERE CLIFT.

REVIEWS.

THE IRISH POLICY OF MR. GLADSTONE.

"Gladstone and Ireland." By Lord Eversley. London: Methuen. 1912. 10s. 6d. net.

IT was the age of Gladstone that invented the Irish problem. This age cherished many false notions; the falsest was that the difficulties between class and class, between religion and religion, in Ireland, and the difficulties between England and her Irish partner, might be solved "finally" by some Act of Parliament, if only the statesman could hit upon the right one. Lord Eversley's book is a record of the rather foolish attempts of British statesmen, acting on this assumption, and particularly of Gladstone, to deal with Ireland from 1854 to 1894. It is published aptly enough on the eve of the introduction of the third Home Rule Bill. Apparently we still believe in an Irish problem that can be got rid of. This "problem" is one of the few Gladstonian traditions that survive.

Parnell of course had no illusions on the subject of Home Rule, but regarded with scorn those Gladstonians who believed that a Parliament sitting in Dublin would bring in the Radical millennium. He cared little for politics as such. As Lord Eversley says, compared with O'Connell and Isaac Butt, his two predecessors, Parnell had none of the qualities which might be expected to qualify him for the position of leader in Ireland, and was without constitutional lore, or historical knowledge, or their powers of constructive legislation; indeed, a similar comparison may be made between Parnell and several of the actual Parnellites. A man of retiring disposition, he seems to have been urged into active life chiefly by the spectacle of Nationalist or Irish (as opposed to Anglo-Irish) Ireland wanting in will, self-respect, and manhood: defects which he attributed to the English domination. A great deal has been made of his personal hatred of England, but it is absurd to suppose that hatred was the motive of all his action. It was his achievement that he united all sections of Nationalist opinion, the clericals, the tenant-righters, the physical force men, under one banner, as no leader before him had succeeded in doing. Of the ethics of Parnellism no adequate defence can be made. It was Parnell who taught Irish Nationalists to say one thing in America and another in England, and yet another at home, and, pending Home Rule, to refuse independent or honest consideration to all vital Irish matters. But it is only fair to remember that Parnell himself regarded Parnellism as a method for merely temporary use. As soon as Gladstone became a Home Ruler, and there had begun that sorry exhibition of humbug and insanity known as the Union of Hearts, his soul seems to have revolted within him; all contemporary observers agree that he gradually lost vigour after the consummation of the Liberal-Nationalist alliance, and indeed stepped into the background of affairs. Lord Eversley refers to his constant absences from the House of Commons during the period from 1886 to 1890, and to Gladstone's far greater activity in the Home Rule propaganda. Parnell's energies were only again released when he had to face the new issues raised by the low-spirited revolt of his followers against his leadership, of which Captain O'Shea's divorce proceedings were nominally the occasion. During the last few months of his life he was shifting the ground of Irish controversy, and was about to destroy his own achievement, for he perceived that if Ireland indeed lacked liberty, the weapons of tyranny and obscurantism would not gain it for her, and that Parnellism had failed to put spirit into his people. His death saved the "cause". Very soon the Irishmen, who had been divided by this matter of Gladstonian and clerical intervention on a real question of principle, again forsook realities in order to be united against the phantoms of landlordism and English rule. The interrupted story was resumed. Mr. Redmond boasts that he stands where Parnell stood, and he is not ashamed that experience has taught him nothing. If

he gets what he wants, it will be by reason of our sheer boredom.

Lord Eversley writes from the Gladstonian point of view, and his attitude is the conventional one that obtained among Liberals from 1886 to 1894. The arguments to be drawn from the events of the nineteenth century are, he thinks, in favour of conceding autonomy in administration and legislation to Ireland; further, whenever such a measure is accomplished it will be recognised that to Mr. Gladstone it will have been mainly due. Lord Eversley's admiration of his old leader's political wisdom and virtue remains at white heat, and so he concludes that because Gladstone abandoned Unionism in despair, therefore Unionism is an impossible policy. Where Gladstone failed none can succeed. In effect, however, Gladstone failed likewise as a Home Ruler. All the world, including the Nationalists, now admits that the passing into law either of the Bill of 1886 or of the Bill of 1893 would have been fatal to the well-being of Ireland. It will be allowed that in his Irish dealings Gladstone showed himself a master of tactics. Parnell himself readily expressed a sense of Gladstone's commanding genius as a politician. "I was no match for him", he said, referring to the negotiations that led to the Home Rule Bill of 1886, "he got the better of me every time". Moreover, it is true that Gladstone is the one English statesman of the nineteenth century who succeeded to any extent in capturing the imagination of the Irish people. Another writer, Mr. F. H. O'Donnell, who was in close touch with Parnellism for a while, has pointed out that Gladstone had no difficulty whatever in subjecting Parnell's party to his influence. He had no sooner taken up Home Rule than almost all the Parnellites became extreme Liberals and Radicals. Even Mr. Healy was abashed, and under Gladstone's eye had the nicest manners, reminding one of a reformed street arab. This domination was the more extraordinary in view of the remarkable ignorance he showed of the real Ireland, of Irish forces and the Irish temper. To Conservatives, aside altogether from his land legislation and his disestablishment of the Irish Church, and even aside from the question of Home Rule, the story of Gladstone's relations with Ireland is sullied by the fact that he negotiated with treason from the Kilmainham affair onwards, for Parnellism was, there can be no doubt, politically a criminal movement; thus, even allowing the Gladstonian contention that government of Ireland from Westminster had been proved impracticable, these various compacts with Parnell were unjustifiable from a constitutional point of view. If, as Lord Eversley seems to imply, Gladstone was all his life moving in the direction of Home Rule, then it is a pity that he did not realise his orientation ten years sooner. With Isaac Butt, Parnell's predecessor and a genuine Constitutionalist, any English statesman might have dealt without loss of prestige or of dignity.

COURT LIFE AT PEKING.

"Two Years in the Forbidden City." By the Princess Der Ling. London: Unwin. 1912. 8s. 6d. net.

THIS is an interesting account of Court life as it presented itself to a Manchu lady who was in constant attendance upon the late Empress-Dowager, during 1903-5, and who had therefore unique opportunities of seeing Palace life behind the screen. The title is not, perhaps, very happily chosen, as it conveys an impression of the Imperial precincts at Peking; whereas the Empress preferred the so-called Summer Palace, where she could indulge in outdoor pursuits. Had we not, indeed, learned much otherwise from current narratives of her career, one might almost imagine from the picture here presented that her life consisted chiefly of *al fresco* entertainments diversified by changes of dress and jewels. Except for one or two conversations with Yuan Shih-kai about the Russo-Japanese war, and an allusion to the Boxer episode which she characterised as the blunder of her life, we hear little about political life.

The Empress gives audience indeed in the morning to her Ministers, but the days seem given up, afterwards, to theatricals and fêtes champêtres where she appears willing that others should enjoy themselves provided she is considered first. The book is, in fact, in a sense, complementary to the history of "China under the Empress-Dowager" reviewed in the SATURDAY of 17 December 1910. If the latter disclosed the intrigues and crises of an adventurous and strenuous career, the curtain is lifted here upon the *vie intime*—the preoccupations and amusements, the tempers, and occasionally the thoughts of the remarkable woman who fills the stage.

We have said that the author had exceptional opportunities. It may be added that she had exceptional qualifications; for she had, during the four years (1899-1903) her father filled the post of Chinese Minister at Paris, opportunities of acquiring a knowledge of French and English and Western ideas which made her extremely useful to the Empress, who recognised this with a partiality that excited, evidently, no little jealousy in her entourage. Except, however, for occasional unpleasantness on that account, and for occasional anxiety caused by the Empress' wish to find her a husband, life seems to have passed pleasantly enough. There was rigid etiquette, frequent kowtowing, wearisome attendance; but the Empress could be kind and generous in her way—as well as harsh and tyrannical upon little provocation or none. No one will sympathise much with a eunuch who tied a fire-cracker to a crow's legs, for the pleasure of seeing it blown up when it began to fly, and who was given a hundred blows—not for his cruelty, but because the explosion disturbed her Majesty's siesta. But a picture of "a bad day for everyone" is more suggestive. The Empress had awoke with a pain in her back, which her ladies had to massage before she could get up. She was out of sorts and temper still; and the climax came when it turned out that the eunuch who dressed her hair every morning was ill, and had ordered another one to take his place. She had a peculiar objection to seeing even one or two hairs fall out. The regular eunuch had a knack of hiding them, but this one wasn't up to the trick. "He got frightened and her Majesty, seeing him through the mirror, asked him whether he had pulled her hair out. He said he had. This made her furious, and she told him to replace it. I almost laughed, but the eunuch was very much frightened, and started to cry. Her Majesty ordered him to leave the room, and said she would punish him later. We helped to fix up her hair. . . . She went to the morning audience as usual; and after that she told the head eunuch (Li Lien-Ying) what had happened. Li, who was indeed a bad and cruel man, said 'Why not beat him to death?' Immediately she ordered him to take the man to his own quarters to receive punishment." All for combing out two or three hairs! Then the food was bad, and the cooks were punished. Then the ladies had all dressed their hair wrong, and were threatened that if it happened again it should be cut off. In fact, she was furious all day, and the author's graphic picture enables us to realise the atmosphere when her Majesty "got out of bed the wrong side". It is only just to remark, however, that other days could be as bright as this was dark; and boating excursions, theatrical performances, gardening experiments and lunches are described, then, with a perspicuity for which we are grateful—not only because the picture is attractive, but because here is exactly the local colour we want to see.

It is amusing too, to hear, behind the scenes, the Empress' comments on her foreign visitors, her eagerness to know what they think, and her shrewd perception of their defects. She likes Madame Uchida, the wife of the Japanese Minister, best because of her extreme politeness; and she is equally keen to note laches. Among the guests at a certain garden party, for instance, there was one lady "dressed in a heavy tweed travelling costume, having enormous pockets, into which she thrust her hands. She wore a cap of the same material. Her Majesty asked if I had noticed this

lady with the clothes made out of 'rice-bags', and asked whether it wasn't rather unusual to be presented at Court in such a dress". It is satisfactory to know that the lady did not belong to any of the Legations; but the episode suggested the issue of invitation cards prescribing suitable dress. "In that way (said the Empress) I can also keep the missionary element out, as well as other undesirables."

We see a good deal, naturally, of the Emperor, who gave the impression of intelligence and character, though subdued and dominated by the aggressive personality to whom all kowtow. And the reflection suggests itself, anew, whether the course of Chinese history might not have been changed if the coup d'état of 1896 had failed, and the reforms which he launched at the instance of Kang Yü-wei had been allowed a trial. The author's connexion with the Court ceased with her father's death at Shanghai in 1905. Away from Peking she "gradually began to realise that, after all, the attractions of Court life had not been able to eradicate the influences which had been brought to bear upon her while in Europe. At heart (she concludes) I was a foreigner, educated in a foreign country; and, having already met my husband, the matter was soon settled, and I became an American citizen. However, I often look back to the two years I spent at the Court of her Majesty the Empress-Dowager of China, as the most eventful and happiest days of my girlhood".

There are a few expressions which suggest the influence of her new surroundings, and a few mistakes which suggest imperfect knowledge or revision. The title of the late Emperor's father, for instance, was Prince Chun, not Chung; and the town on the Yangtze alluded to on page 87 must be Shasi, not Shansi which is the name of a province. But these are trifling defects which do not lessen the pleasure afforded by a picture of the vie intime of the Imperial Court under conditions which have now, probably, for ever passed away.

HOME RULE EX PARTE.

"Against Home Rule—The Case for the Union." By Arthur James Balfour M.P., J. Austen Chamberlain M.P., and others. With an Introduction by Sir Edward Carson K.C. M.P., and a Preface by A. Bonar Law M.P. Edited by S. Rosenbaum. London: Warne. 1912. 1s. net.

UNIONISTS are not logically bound to make a case for the Union: the burden of proof should lie with their opponents. Home Rule is an experiment in reaction, proposing to undo the process of history. A priori no body of legislators would dream of framing a federal constitution for so small an area as the British Islands. As Mr. Balfour points out in a short essay of the present volume: "If we could erase the past and approach the problem of framing representative institutions in their most practicable shape for the inhabitants of the United Kingdom, who would think it wise to crowd into these small Islands two, or, as some would have it, three, four, or five separate Parliaments, with their separate sets of Ministers and Offices, their separate party systems, their divergent policies?" Where, then, is the broad general ground for the Nationalists' demand of Home Rule for Ireland? Is it administrative? Granted that the Parliament of the United Kingdom is overweighted, and that some of the work should be thrown on subordinate assemblies, who would dream on general principles of trying this experiment of decentralisation in Ireland, where difficulties of party and of finance are so unmeasurably greater than in Scotland, say, or Wales? Do they make the demand on the ground of history? Here Mr. Balfour is unanswerable. "The ordinary British Home Ruler", he says, "pictures Ireland before the English invasion as an organised and independent State, happy in possession of a native polity which Englishmen have ruthlessly destroyed, now suffering under laws and institutions forced upon her by the conquerors, suit-

able it may be to men of Anglo-Saxon descent, but utterly alien to the genius and temper of a Keltic population". This is untrue to history; and if it were true, the Nationalist remedy is peculiarly Hibernian. To undo the work of institutions "utterly alien to the genius and temper of a Keltic population", they would set up in Dublin a Parliament, the most Anglo-Saxon of the many Anglo-Saxon institutions of the conqueror. This is the kind of nonsense to which the case for Home Rule is inevitably reduced as soon as the demand of the Nationalists is made on broad grounds of policy or history.

Apart from the frank appeal to race prejudice or windy rhetoric about self-government, the case for Home Rule has formerly rested upon solid ground at one point only. The case for Home Rule twenty years ago was the state of Ireland, and it is a small portion of the task undertaken by the contributors to the present volume to show conclusively that this part of the case—such as it was—no longer exists. Mr. Gerald Balfour and Mr. George Wyndham, in two ably written chapters upon Unionist land policy, describe the revolution that has taken place in Ireland with the introduction of Land Purchase and the rural development of the country under the Irish Agricultural Organisation Society. Mr. Wyndham, in his article upon Irish Land Purchase, shows how the poverty and discontent upon which Nationalist politics have thriven for so long have tended to disappear wherever his Act has had fair play. Further progress was balked by Mr. Birrell's Act of 1909. Ireland owes her prosperity to-day to land purchase and to the work of Sir Horace Plunkett and the I.A.O.S. The Nationalists are fully awake to the importance of keeping up a case for Home Rule by keeping down the prosperity of Ireland. Sir Horace was driven from his office on the pretext that it should be held by an M.P. Mr. T. W. Russell, who succeeded, and began immediately to intrigue against the I.A.O.S., lost his seat in the General Election of 1910; but has not yet lost his office.

The historical arguments for Irish Nationalism are ably met in chapters by Mr. Fisher and Mr. Amery. Mr. Austen Chamberlain deals with the finance of Home Rule, Mr. Walter Long with the special pleading that urges Home Rule as the sole means of removing from the Imperial Parliament some portion of the legislative burden. The military, naval, and religious difficulties are also measured. Sir Edward Carson's introduction to the book is an able résumé, holding together the main threads of argument; and he defines the character of the book in its relation to Unionist policy. The authors assume no collective responsibility, every contributor being responsible for the views put forward in his own particular chapter. The book is not in the constructive section an official statement; but naturally the authors' views represent in the main "the policy which the Unionist Government, when returned to power, will have to carry into effect". As Mr. Bonar Law says in the preface: "The articles are written by men who not only have a complete grasp of the subjects upon which they write, but who in most cases, from their past experience and their personal influence, are well entitled to outline the Irish policy of the Unionist Party". Mr. Bonar Law contrasts the policy of Unionists and Home Rulers in a neat antithesis: "The Nationalist policy, which is imposed also on the Radical Party, is, in fact, more politics and less industry. Our policy is more industry and less politics".

PROFANE FINGERS ON SACRED PICTURES.

"Madonne Fiorentina." By Mario Ferrigni. Milan: Hoepli. 1912. Lire 18.

THE title of this handsome volume is certainly most alluring, but unfortunately it misleads entirely. From the title we should have expected the book to contain a reasoned description of the finest altarpieces, pictures and sculptured representations of the Madonna

by the great painters and sculptors of Florence. Instead of that the author wanders in desultory fashion, but always in very choice Italian, over a wide field of art, and indulges in ultra-modern reflections that have nothing to do with Florentine Madonnas. Of the two hundred and seventy-six beautiful illustrations one hundred and eighty-three only are of the Madonna, and by no means all are by the painters of Florence. The Sienese, the Umbrian, the Lombard, the Venetian, the Emilian schools are all represented; even Murillo and Rubens find a place; while the series winds up with Tiepolo, Domenico Morelli, and the modern abomination by Barabino. Among the remaining ninety-three illustrations we find subjects so varied as Raphael's "Donna Gravida", a number of giovinette ignote, several Magdalens, Masaccio's "Desco da parto", Botticelli's Birth of Venus, Spring, Pallas, and Venus and Mars, Leonardo's Monna Lisa ("che fu al Louvre"—as has actually now to be recorded), and a tasteless modern work by Ussi called "La Mamma". All this is sufficient to show the reader that the subject of the book does not correspond with its title, and that no orderly instructive description of the Madonnas of Florence is to be looked for. So far as the author has any object or plan, it seems to be a species of glorification of mundane woman, and his flippant sentiments often jar in the presence of masterpieces where the painter had in his mind quite another glorification of the body, the perfectly human but glorified body of the Resurrection. Nothing could show less sympathy with art and a great artist, or more thoroughly emphasise the tendency of the book under review, than the reproduction of an early sketch of a Madonna in the nude by Fra Bartolommeo. Vasari tells us that Baccio della Porta, not yet become a Dominican friar, burnt all his studies from the nude in the deplorable Savonarola bonfires. If this sketch, never intended for public exhibition, be really by the young Baccio, regard for his memory and wishes and his heroic sacrifice should surely exclude it from any but a technical work. But there is an object in introducing it here, and the comble of bad taste is reached by quoting in full a sonnet of D'Annunzio, in which he excuses himself for depicting his mistress in her bath on the ground that Bartolommeo, a friar and now in Heaven,

"la Nostra Donna in sua gentil movenza
ritrasse ignuda."

Baccio, in his youth, sketched the nude that he might the more perfectly cover and drape; D'Annunzio, with a pen as fine as the friar-painter's brush, writes that he may uncover, and without scruple deliberately seeks to identify one of the purest of mankind with his own fleshly fancies. What a lack of understanding and feeling it shows to associate such a painter and such a poet!

Signor Ferrigni shows great talent, has a delightful sense of style, much insight and penetration, and the knack of happy thought. It is happy to say that Orcagna's Tabernacolo in Orsanmichele has all the magnificence and artistic value of a cathedral. It shows insight and discrimination to say that the quattrocento lasted till 1520; that the real cinquecento lasted for a comparatively brief period; and that the seicento began before its century and lasted for a century of about two hundred and fifty years. Some of the purely art pages are excellent and suggestive; the chapter on Giotto, most difficult of all to do, is best of all done. The author, we are convinced, could do good work on pictures, for he has a fine artistic sense. But we cannot sympathise with the point of view he has taken up in this book. He is palpitatingly modern; and it is obvious that he has not yet brought himself to look upon the great works of the quattro- and early cinquecento with contemporary eyes. He shows, for instance, that he is wholly unaware that the presence and peculiar position of S. Anne in Masaccio's picture in the Florence Academy is due to the fact that it is a S. Anne altarpiece. He even calls the introduction of S. Anne a novel feature, and attributes it to Masaccio, while

this fashion of dealing with similar altarpieces had long been in vogue. He moreover appears to think that artists painted altarpieces "on spec" in the hope of finding a client, not knowing that the altarpiece depended entirely on the size, design, and dedication of the altar, which had first to be determined before its pictorial decoration could be begun. Thus he imagines, in common with such writers as Séailles and Solomon Reinach, that Leonardo began the Virgin of the Rocks in Florence, carrying it with him to Milan, whereas the recent discovery of the contract furnishes documentary evidence of what could easily be deduced from the common practice, that the picture was a commission given at Milan after the altar and altar-frame were ready to receive it. Signor Ferrigni reveals a defect common to many art-writers—a want of knowledge of the motive which brought an altarpiece into existence, of the practice which governed its commission, and of the rules of theology which guided its execution.

AN EGOIST—WITH APOLOGIES ETC.

"In Cotton Wool." By W. B. Maxwell. London: Hutchinson. 1912. 6s.

FROM its serious foreword, and the relentless gravity with which it is written, one realises that Mr. Maxwell's latest novel is intended as a tract for the times. He tells us that "one of the greatest evils of our modern civilisation is the steady increase of egoism", and he seems to conceive of the egoist as "a man with a moderate but assured income who can find people who in exchange for his money will perform for him nearly all the duties of manhood"; enabling him thus "to wrap himself in cotton wool and evade the shocks and perils of active existence". Without disputing his proposition, which not only admits of dispute but is compounded from a confusion of significances, it may be doubted if he bases on his text the most convincing sort of sermon. Leonard Calcraft is no doubt an egoist, but of a type to which the present century can lay no peculiar claim, since his egoism is merely an excessive selfishness. We meet him in attendance on his invalid father, a radiant example of filial piety to the little watering-place in which they live; but this pleasing trait is the only one permitted to his sordid composition, though the novelist's experience might have shown him the value of some further relief. It is true that, in the emotional crisis of his father's death, he shows generous intentions in the disposal of his property, but these resolutions rapidly wither, and thereafter his own concerns almost entirely absorb him to the exclusion of every altruistic impulse. He depends apparently a good deal—the dependence is discreetly veiled—on feminine consolations, and has been keeping a naturally good girl waiting for seven years, apparently as his mistress—but here again the discretion exceeds the lucidity—for his father's death, in order that he may be "free" to marry her. But freedom only prompts him to be rid of her; and, a few months later, having accepted a proposal from another woman, he abandons her also, on the eve of the wedding, for fear he should find her personality exhausting. The remainder of the story is occupied with his attempts to re-establish with his first love, now prosperously married, their old relations, whatever they may have been, and with a crude love affair with a vulgar little girl who is hoping to become an actress, whose unflattering asperity finally deals a shock to his reason from which it cannot recover, and we part from him in a mad-house, robbed of his cotton wool, except what goes to the padding of a strait "waistcoat".

Such a sermon, since it is impossible to appraise it otherwise, might surely have made by other methods a more effective appeal. It may be true that selfishness conduces to insanity, as Mr. Maxwell would have us believe, but it is so uncertain a consequence that it can scarcely serve as a deterrent to the average man, who sees selfishness as often as not successful and happily accommodated. To his egoist

one can attribute the emptiness of Calcraft's middle age, and if the author had carried his moral no further he would have moved us more, since the daily despair of the sane is a more tragic punishment than the lunatic's emancipation, which it is moreover impossible to refer to the mild indulgence of the hero's over-developed instinct for self-preservation.

Artistically the book makes no great claim. It is a careful, painstaking compilation, an effort being made to produce effects by a persistent agglutination of material without any very clear perception of its quality as evidence. There is not from cover to cover the faintest suggestion of style, or of any matrix of art in which the ephemeral insect of its theme might hope, embedded, to achieve perpetuity. There is the same terrible entanglement of tenses, so familiar a trapping of feminine sentimentality, the sloppiest of all dramatic expedients; and a school-girl's verbal indifference to the fitness of auxiliaries, which have already distinguished Mr. Maxwell's manner. There is perhaps in such errors a shade less of exuberance; and in the description of advancing disease a less unpleasant display of pathology than one remembers in the writer's previous work; indeed, Calcraft's collapse comes as an insufficiently prepared surprise. There is a sobriety and steadiness of purpose in the development of his slow descent to the mad-house which are the author's most admirable qualities as a delineator; but which, unsupported, seem unable ever to lift him from the plodding circumstance of his theme.

SHORTER NOTICES.

"The Commercial Laws of the World." Vols. VII. and VIII. The United States of America. London: Butterworth. 1912. 42s. each Vol.

These two volumes of this valuable work have arrived somewhat before their time, but in view of the importance of their subject their immediate publication is welcome, and we can wait with complacency for the intervening volumes which deal with the small South American States. It is with the United States law that the English lawyer probably comes most often into contact. In many cases the common law of individual States springs from the same source as the common law of this country; and in such matters as the law of companies (a vast subject which occupies the whole of the second volume), of the sale of goods, of negotiable instruments, and of bankruptcy, American legislation has followed more or less closely the British model. Decided cases in each country often prove of assistance in the courts of the other, as is shown by the practice of many English text-book writers, who make a point, as Sir William Anson does in his book on Contracts, of quoting relevant American cases; and it would be impossible to exaggerate the usefulness of a full and careful compilation of American statute and case law such as is found in these two volumes. The complications introduced by the existence side by side of Federal and State systems of common and statute law have, of course, increased enormously the scope of the work, which is prefaced by a useful introduction by Professor Huberich in which the relation between the two systems is set out with admirable lucidity and completeness. State law has been dealt with by eleven other lawyers from different States, who have collaborated in the task; and the second volume is practically a digest of company Acts, including the famous Sherman Act against monopolies which, though so stringent in its terms, has proved so uncertain in its operation. A few notes on the cases decided under this Act would have been useful; but that, no doubt, would be more than could be reasonably expected.

"The Book of Ceremonial Magic." By Arthur E. Waite. London: Rider. 1911. 15s. net.

Drawing-room wizards and Canidias at three guineas the afternoon are now so much the fashion that our dabblers in occultism will eagerly consult a sumptuous volume which deals with everything goetic and cabalistic. Here they will find all about the key of Solomon, whereby are evoked the two-and-seventy ghoulish spirits shut up by that monarch in a brazen vessel, and cast into a deep lake, and Mr. Waite describes at length with diagrams every one of the six times twelve "ways of accomplishing all abominations"; contrariwise the Deity has seventy-two sacred names. Here are described the mysteries of the Grand Grimoire, or the infernal devices of the Great Agrippa for the discovery of all hid treasures, and the subjugation of every denomination of ghostly existence, and the Grimoire of Honorius, which

possesses the distinction of being the most frankly diabolical of all the rituals of black magic; the seven Olympic Spirits; the seven Mysterious Orisons ascribed to Pope Leo III.; the Planetary Hierarchies; the Unveiled Isis; the realm of vampires, genii, stryges, lemures, and witch's sabbaths; the virtue of spells, philtres, talismans, astral conjurations, enchantments, and art-magic generally—from all these Mr. Waite draws back for thrilled readers a corner of the curtain which hides the portal of the closed palace. He takes his task very seriously—"I am concerned first of all with the preservation of the Secret Tradition inviolate and with the separation of fungoids and diseased and monstrous growths which have come to overlay it." Modern esoteric theosophy, so far as it is not merely silly, is part of a recrudescence of diabolism. No real distinction can be drawn between white and black magic, save that the former is idle and the latter evil, but both are illicit.

"Revue des Deux Mondes." 1er Avril.

M. Pinon concludes in this number his comprehensive and judicial study of the relations between France and Germany. In this second part he deals with the years 1898 to 1912, and it is principally devoted to the situation arising from the establishment of the Entente Cordiale and the development of the Morocco question. He says very truly that it is impossible to understand the personal policy of William II. unless we always imagine him as retaining at the bottom of his heart the desire to be friendly with England. We are to seek for the turning-point in the relations of England and Germany between October 1901 and January 1902, during the Boer War. King Edward paid his memorable visit to Paris in May 1903. The writer remarks with justice that, if France had determined to involve herself in the Morocco business, she should have made sure that Germany was squared as well as England, or, if her principal aim was to join England in resisting the German hegemony in Europe, she should not have plunged into the Moorish morass.

THE APRIL REVIEWS.

The April Reviews are scarcely so full of the coal strike as one might reasonably expect, whilst only three deal in anticipation with Home Rule. "An Outsider" in the "Fortnightly" endeavours to prove that all Ireland's woes followed on the Act of Union. He urges Home Rule because he does not believe in repeal, and is of opinion that Home Rule commends itself to England as a pledge of Ireland's loyalty to the Empire: that is a truly great discovery. When did Home Rule commend itself to England? Mr. Erskine Childers, in the "Nineteenth Century," makes another discovery: "Virtually Ireland is now governed as a dependent Crown Colony." Which of the Crown Colonies has representation in the Imperial Parliament—representation, moreover, which gives the power to dictate terms to one of the two great parties? "A scheme which throws on Ireland complete responsibility for all her own expenditure and taxation is the only one which genuinely fulfils all the required conditions." It might puzzle Mr. Childers to show how any conceivable Home Rule Bill could do anything of the sort. In the "Westminster" are two short articles, one by Mr. T. Galloway Rigg, who cannot understand on what questions Catholics and Protestants need engage in conflict; and a second by "W. E. C.", who discusses the composition of the Irish Legislature in the light of colonial and other experience. Some useful information for Unionist platforms will be found in the April number of "Irish Facts", issued by the Union Defence League. Mr. V. Hussey Walsh renders service to the Unionist cause abroad by an article, "A la Veille du Home Rule", which he contributes to the "Revue Hebdomadaire"—a publication which appeals to Liberal Catholic opinion in France. His account of the difficulties which have to be overcome and of the objections to Home Rule by the business men of Ireland, Roman Catholic as well as Protestant, will give "the intelligent foreigner" an opportunity of understanding that the arguments against Home Rule are not mere ascendancy arguments.

The "National Review" devotes the larger part of its editorial "Episodes" to the politics of the strike. There is also a discussion by "Pollio" of "Strikes and the Australian Remedy". In the "Fortnightly" Mr. Sidney Low also discusses the anti-strike legislation of Australia. In the "Contemporary" there is an article on "The Mining Industry of Britain" by Mr. William Brace; and in the "Nineteenth Century" there is an article, also largely devoted to the economics of the question, by Mr. George Blake Walker. Of more general interest is Sir Henry Seton-Karr's review of the position in the "Nineteenth Century".

under the title "We are the Government Now". The miners are in the position described in these words of the Federation leader (1) because they deal with a monopoly of the first necessity of British industry; (2) because they have been freed by trade-union legislation from all legal obligations. The importance of their industry to the nation, Sir Henry urges, gives the community a right to exercise a constant and effective supervision of its conditions. It also makes it a duty of Government to anticipate events—a general strike, for instance—and to provide against them in advance. The writer charges the Government first with neglecting to provide against a strike which was distinctly threatened; second, with passing a Bill, involving a complete reversal of industrial conditions under duress of panic.

There are two rather striking articles in the "Fortnightly" as to general Unionist policy, both written over a *nom de guerre*. "Curio" writes of "The Unionist Programme". "Curio" suggests that a minimum wage will have to be put on the Unionist programme for every trade definitely affected by Tariff Reform. He urges that it should be applied first of all to the lower grades of industrial life, and should be "protected in its application by the free use of the tariff". "Curio's" main reason for so startling a proposal is scarcely adequate. "Anyone who has studied with care the methods of Mr. Lloyd George knows perfectly well that his unbridled eloquence will not be devoted to a frontal assault on a popular Tariff Bill. He may, indeed, pick out the hard cases and back them with a few academic speeches sufficient to satisfy the really genuine Cobdenites, but his main attack will be of a totally different character. He will devote himself to proving not that Protection is bad in itself, but that it is good only for the manufacturer. Nothing will make any headway against the orgy of misrepresentation we may expect, except the firm conviction on the part of the electorate—a conviction only to be secured by practical action and legislation—that the Unionist party is really concerned for the welfare of the people."

It may be tactics, but it is scarcely policy to take up big legislative projects merely in order to deprive the Opposition of an argument. "Curio's" general policy of social reform is, however, admirable. As he says, there are plenty of arrears. "There is housing, always the special sphere of Toryism, as the Unionist defeat of the Government on Sir A. Boscawen's Housing Bill proved last month. There is Poor Law Reform, which for three years now since the report of the Royal Commission has been thrust into the background while the Coalition intrigue with a series of disruptive measures which can benefit no single living being. Beyond this the whole system of local and Imperial taxation has long been in urgent need of revision, and so gigantic is the task that this in itself would occupy the greater part of the session." "Auditor Tantum", the second anonymous writer in the "Fortnightly", criticises the leadership of Mr. Bonar Law with undue severity. He slights the value of Mr. Law's criticism of Mr. Lloyd George at the Albert Hall, and even prejudices him adversely in his duel with Mr. Asquith as to the jobbery return. These returns have yet to appear.

Mr. F. E. Smith's "The True Lines of Temperance Reform" is perhaps the ablest political—unfortunately "temperance" is to-day a political subject—article of the month. His sketch of the origin and history of the misuse of the word "temperance" is extremely well done. Scarcely any word is more hopelessly misused: "In so far as the great bulk of so-called temperance reformers are concerned, temperance is altogether the wrong word. The dictionaries tell us that temperance means moderation; the fanatical 'temperance' reformers tell us that it means total abstinence; and, now that drunkenness is a waning evil, these propagandists actually declare, on the platform and in their journals, that 'the fight now is against the moderate drinker'". The curious anomalies of language that have grown up round the "temperance" movement are well pointed in a survival from gin-drinking days in the North of England: "The ravages of excessive gin-drinking among the lower classes, and to some extent of brandy-drinking in the upper classes, certainly led these early reformers to advocate the entire disuse of spirits in which the intoxicating element was so potent; but they did not preach total abstinence from the fermented drinks—wines and beers; and even to this day one may find a curious survival of this old-fashioned temperance in the North of England and in Ireland among persons who will tell you that they are pledged teetotallers, and therefore only drink port wine—in Ireland, I believe, frequently adding stout." Mr. F. E. Smith finds the remedy for national drunkenness not in penal legislation, which has converted the public-house into a mere drinking-bar, but in the improvement of drinking-bars into houses and clubs for the people. He sketches several types of house which would arise were the licensing laws to be reformed in the direction

of true temperance. We find here an attractive and ably-reasoned alternative to the Radical view.

The April Number of the "Burlington Magazine" covers very various ground. Byzantine Enamels in the Pierpont Morgan collection; the Louvre's recent acquisition of Giovanni Bellini's "The Redeemer" for the modest price of £3000; "Antiquities of S. Andrews", by Signor G. Rivoira; "Principles and Evolution of Furniture-making", the first number of a series; Mr. Fry's second paper on the lately closed Early Venetian Exhibition in Savile Row, and Mr. Dodgson's article on "Stayreuser, an Unknown Landscape Artist" working about 1600, and apparently known now only by a drawing in the National Gallery of Scotland, are the chief illustrated contributions. Apropos of the Bellini just bought for the Louvre for 75,000 francs, the question of relative sale prices is pertinently raised. If so fine a work is sold at this low figure, what about the purchase of Corot's "La femme à la perle" for 165,000 francs? The wits in Paris see in this extravagance an effort to make good the loss of "La Joconde". Mr. C. H. Collins Baker notes that recently discovered signatures prove that the National Gallery possesses pictures by Jan de Bray and Pieter Claesz, painters hitherto supposed to be unrepresented.

For this Week's Books see page 470.

DISTINCTIVE SYSTEM OF ASSURANCE.

LOW PREMIUMS. LOW EXPENSES.
LARGE ULTIMATE BONUSES.
FUNDS - - - £15,000,000.

SCOTTISH PROVIDENT INSTITUTION.

London: 3 Lombard Street, E.C. West End: 17 Pall Mall, S.W.
HEAD OFFICE: 6 ST. ANDREW SQUARE, EDINBURGH.

SUN LIFE

OFFICE. Estd. 1810.

LIFE & ENDOWMENT ASSURANCES.

WITH or WITHOUT MEDICAL EXAMINATION.

ANNUITIES. SINKING FUNDS.

"SCIENTIFIC SAVING," post free on application to the General Manager, 63 Threadneedle Street, London, E.C.

ALLIANCE

ASSURANCE COMPANY, LIMITED.

Head Office: BARTHOLOMEW LANE, LONDON.

ASSETS EXCEED £22,000,000.

Chairman:

Right Hon. LORD ROTHSCHILD, G.C.V.O.

Among the Classes of Insurance transacted by the Company are the following:—

- (1) LIFE INSURANCE, with and without profits, with special provisions for the payment of Estate Duties.
- (2) FIRE INSURANCE of every description.
- (3) INSURANCES TO COVER LOSS OF RENT, INTEREST, AND PROFIT consequent upon Fire damage to property.
- (4) MARINE INSURANCE.
- (5) BURGLARY, THEFT, AND PLATE GLASS INSURANCE.
- (6) ACCIDENT, including Personal Accident, Motor Car and Employers' Liability Insurance.

Fidelity Guarantee and Sinking Fund Policies are also granted.

Applications for Agencies are entertained, and Prospectuses with other papers may be had on written or personal application.

ROBERT LEWIS, General Manager.

THE STANDARD LIFE ASSURANCE CO.

ESTABLISHED 1825. INCORPORATED 1910.

PROGRESS OF THE BUSINESS

Reported at the EIGHTY-SIXTH ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING of the Company, held at Edinburgh, on Tuesday, 9th April, 1912. W. J. Dundas, Esq., C.S., in the Chair.

Amount of Assurances accepted during the year 1911, for which 4,186 Policies were issued	£2,209,735
Of this amount there was re-assured with other offices	£277,967
Leaving net amount of New Assurances for the year	£1,931,768
Claims by Death during the year, with Bonus Additions	£713,876
Claims under Endowments and Endowment Assurances, with Bonus Additions	£185,491
Total Claims during the year...	£899,367
Increase in the Funds during the year	£238,662
Subsisting Assurances at 15th November, 1911	£29,556,254
Accumulated Funds after deducting Current Liabilities	£13,023,022
Revenue for the year	£1,555,245

EDINBURGH—3 GEORGE STREET (Head Office).

LONDON—83 King William Street, E.C., and 3 Pall Mall East, S.W.

ABERDEEN—173a Union Street.

BELFAST—22a Donegall Place.

BIRMINGHAM—Cannon Street.

BRISTOL—44 Baldwin Street.

CARDIFF—36 Windsor Place.

GLASGOW—102 Hope Street.

LEEDS—City Square.

DUBLIN—59 Dawson Street.

LIVERPOOL—28 Exchange Street, East.

MANCHESTER—65 King Street.

NEWCASTLE—25 Pilgrim Street.

GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY

Mortgages.] ESTABLISHED 1837. [Annuities.

FUNDS EXCEED £2,000,000.

Chief Office: 103 CANNON STREET, LONDON, E.C.

Board of Directors.

ALFRED JAMES SHEPHERD, Esq., Chairman.

Lord ARTHUR CECIL, Deputy Chairman.

H. J. BRACEY, Esq.

H. E. DUKE, Esq., K.C., M.P.

Hon. R. C. GROSVENOR.

Sir JOHN JARDINE, K.C.I.E., M.P.

C. E. VERNON RUTTER, Esq.

ROBERT HENRY SCOTT, Esq., F.R.S., D.Sc.

Rt. Hon. Viscount VALENTIA, C.B., M.V.O., M.P.

Double advantage policies issued securing two payments of the amount assured—one payment on the attainment of a specific age, and a second payment at death thereafter.

Advances made on Reversions, vested or contingent, and Life Interests, and on Personal Security in connection with a Life Policy.

JOHN ROBERT FREEMAN, Manager and Secretary.

EAGLE INSURANCE COMPANY

(ESTABLISHED 1807).

Whole-Life, Non-Profit Policies at
SPECIAL LOW RATES.

World-wide and Indisputable Policies with
GUARANTEED SURRENDER VALUES.

Apply for revised Prospectus.

Head Office: 79 PALL MALL, LONDON, S.W.

BRITISH EQUITABLE

ASSURANCE COMPANY, Ltd.

FUNDS EXCEED ... £1,739,000.

SUBSCRIBED CAPITAL ... £300,000.

PAID-UP CAPITAL ... £30,000.

**LIFE. FIRE. ACCIDENT.
BURGLARY.**

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY.

Write for particulars of Guaranteed Con-
tracts securing a Bonus of £2 per cent.

To the MANAGER, 1, 2 & 3 Queen Street Place, London, E.C.

PRUDENTIAL ASSURANCE COMPANY

(LIMITED),

HOLBORN BARS, LONDON, E.C.

INVESTED FUNDS - £80,060,000.

CLAIMS PAID - £94,000,000.

THE STRIKE'S AFTERMATH.

STARVATION

FOR THOUSANDS THROUGHOUT THE LAND.

THE CHURCH ARMY

is relieving distress by giving work to UNEMPLOYED BREAD-
WINNERS in numerous Labour Homes and Depots in all parts of
the country, and hundreds of evangelists and mission-sisters in town
and country parishes are searching out starving families and supplying
them with

FOOD AND FUEL.

THE NEED IS STILL MOST URGENT.

Cheques, &c., crossed "Barclay's, a/c Church Army," pay-
able to Prebendary CARLILE, Hon. Chief Secretary, Headquarters,
55 Bryanston Street, W.

CHELTENHAM COLLEGE SCHOLARSHIPS.

Examination June 4th, 5th and 6th. At least Eight Entrance Scholarships,
value £80 to £100, and some House Exhibitions will be offered to Candidates
who are not already in the College, whether Senior or Junior Department, including
James of Hereford Scholarship, value £35 per annum, with preference for boys
born, educated or residing in Herefordshire. Also, open to all, three Army
Scholarships, two Old Cheltonian Scholarships, one Francis Wylie Scholarship.

Some Nominations for Sons of the Clergy, value £30 per annum, are open
for next term. Apply to the BURSAR, the College, Cheltenham.

**MALVERN COLLEGE. SCHOLARSHIP EXAM-
INATION, June 4th, 5th and 6th.** One or two of £80, five or more of
£50, five or more of £30 (£20 for Day Boys) per annum. Faber Exhibitions of £15
for one year awarded to the boy who does best in Examination. Council Nomi-
nations, value £15 per annum, may be awarded to boys who do well but fail to obtain
a Scholarship. For particulars apply to the Head Master or Secretary.

NOTICE.

The Terms of Subscription to the SATURDAY REVIEW are:—

	United Kingdom.	Abroad.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
One Year	1 8 2	1 10 4
Half Year	0 14 1	0 15 2
Quarter Year	0 7 1	0 7 7

Cheques and Money Orders should be crossed and made payable to the
Manager, SATURDAY REVIEW Offices, 10 King Street, Covent
Garden, London, W.C.

In the event of any difficulty being experienced in obtaining the
SATURDAY REVIEW, the Publisher would be glad to be informed
immediately.

See this week's Issue of
"THE WORLD"
 and Support the
**National Petition
 Against Home Rule
 being passed in the
 Present Parliament**

Petition forms supplied gratuitously, and
 all necessary information on application to

"THE WORLD,"
 1 YORK STREET,
 COVENT GARDEN, LONDON, W.C.

"Saturday"
BRIDGE

By W. DALTON.

Dalton's "Saturday" Bridge is
 admitted to be the standard work
 on the best of card games.

"Saturday" Bridge takes its name
 from the "Saturday Review," in
 which its chapters first appeared.
 It is now in its Eleventh Thousand
 and may be had of all booksellers
 5s. net, or post free from the office
 of the "SATURDAY REVIEW,"
 10 King St., Covent Garden, 5s.4d.

A Companion Volume to "SATURDAY" BRIDGE
 is "Saturday" Auction Bridge, by HELLESPONT,
 3s. 6d. net, or 3s. 9d. post free. "Inferences at
 Bridge," by W. DALTON, price 1s. net, or 1s. 1½d.
 post free.

THIS WEEK'S BOOKS.

FICTION.

The Land of To-morrow (William Westrup). Alston Rivers. 6s.
 Lucrezia Borgia's One Love (H. Grahame Richards). Black-
 wood. 6s.
 The Family Living (E. H. Lacon Watson). Murray. 6s.
 A Superman in Being (Litchfield Woods). Swift. 6s.
 A Bachelor's Comedy (J. E. Buckrose). Mills and Boon. 6s.
 Little Incidents (Frederick Watson). Hodder and Stoughton.
 2s. 6d. net.
 The Sisters and Green Magic (Dermot O'Byrne). Daniel. 2s. 6d.
 net.

HISTORY AND ARCHÆOLOGY.

The New History (James Harvey Robinson). Macmillan. 6s. 6d.
 net.
 Italian Castles and Country Seats (Tryphosa Bates Batcheller).
 Longmans. 25s. net.

REPRINTS.

Aristotle's Constitution of Athens (Sir John Edwin Sandys).
 Macmillan. 12s. 6d. net.
 Marie Tudor, La Esmeralda, Angelo (Victor Hugo); Les Feuilles
 d'Automne, Les Chants du Crépuscule (Victor Hugo).
 Nelson. 1s. net each.
 Jerusalem (Eustace Reynolds-Ball). Black. 2s. 6d. net.
 The Land of Goshen and the Exodus (Sir Hanbury Brown,
 K.C.M.G.). Stanford. 3s. net.

TRAVEL.

The Mafulu Mountain People of British New Guinea (Robert W.
 Williamson). Macmillan. 14s. net.
 On the Backwaters of the Nile (Rev. A. L. Kitching). Fisher
 Unwin. 12s. 6d. net.
 My Life at Sea (Commander W. Cairns Crutchley). Chapman
 and Hall. 7s. 6d. net.

VERSE AND DRAMA.

Lincoln and Ann Rutledge (Denton J. Snider). St. Louis: Sigma
 Publishing Co.
 Songs of a Navy (Patrick MacGill). Published at 4 Cloisters,
 Windsor. 1s. net.
 The Wilderness: An American Play (Adapted by Floyd Jenkins
 and Richard Putnam Darrow). New York: Broadway Pub-
 lishing Co. \$1.
 Party Whips (Ian D. Colvin). Palmer. 1s. net.
 Poems (C.W.M.), 3s. 6d.; Meneas and Palima and Other Poems
 (Lily May Davis), 1s. Drane.
 Moods, Songs, and Doggerels (John Galsworthy). Heinemann.
 5s. net.

NATURAL HISTORY.

Animal Life in Africa (Major J. Stevenson-Hamilton). Heine-
 mann. 18s. net.

SCHOOL BOOK.

A Biblical History for Junior Forms: Old Testament (F. J.
 Foakes-Jackson). Cambridge: Heffer. 2s. 6d.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Beverages (J. Alan Murray). Constable. 1s. net.
 Défense de la Poésie Française (Emile Legouis). Constable.
 5s. net.
 How to make an Orchard in British Columbia (J. T. Bealby).
 Black. 1s. 6d. net.
 Leaves of Prose (Annie Matheson. With two Studies by May
 Sinclair). Swift. 5s. net.
 Psychology and Crime (Thomas Holmes). Dent. 1s. net.
 REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES FOR APRIL.—Fry's Magazine, 6d. net;
 The Empire Magazine, 6d. net; The Socialist Review, 6d.
 net; The English Church Review, 6d. net; Revista Ligure;
 The Mask, 4s. net; The Poetry Review, 6d. net; The
 Century Magazine, 1s. 4d.; Current Literature, 25 cents;
 The Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society, 5s. net.; Harper's
 Monthly Magazine, 1s.; United Empire; The Dublin Review,
 5s. 6d. net.

Messrs. SOTHERAN'S WEST-END HOUSE

IS NOW IN ENLARGED PREMISES AT

43 PICCADILLY, W.

(OPPOSITE PRINCE'S HALL).

BOOKS, ENGRAVINGS AND AUTOGRAPHS

on View; Valued for Insurance or Probate; Bought for Cash.

Telephone: Mayfair 3401.

Telegraphic Address: Bookmen, London.

The Sorrows of Ireland.

By "PAT." 1s. net.

EVERYONE INTERESTED IN THE IRISH PROBLEM
 SHOULD READ THIS BOOK.

THE WEST STRAND PUBLISHING CO., Ltd.,

10 King Street, Covent Garden, W.C.

The CASE AGAINST HOME RULE.

BY

L. S. AMERY, M.P.,

*Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford.***NOW READY.****3d. net.**

CONTENTS.

- I. FOREWORD.
- II. IRELAND BEFORE THE UNION.
- III. FROM THE UNION TO THE HOME RULE BILLS.
- IV. THE UNIONIST RECONSTRUCTION.
- V. UNIONISM AND TARIFF REFORM.
- VI. UNIONISM AND THE IRISH SEA.
- VII. FURTHER DEVELOPMENTS OF UNIONIST POLICY.
- VIII. IRELAND A NATION.
- IX. THE COLONIAL ARGUMENT.
- X. THE FEDERAL ARGUMENTS.
- XI. THE MEANER ARGUMENTS.
- XII. FINANCE (1).
- XIII. FINANCE (2).
- XIV. ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES OF SEPARATISM.
- XV. IRELAND UNDER THE NATIONALISTS.
- XVI. THE POSITION OF ULSTER.
- XVII. CONCLUSION.

"Mr. Amery enters a strong plea that at a time when Ireland is enjoying the benefit of remedial legislation nothing should be done to throw the country back into the turmoil of political and religious strife. A vigorous controversialist, but one who has the historian's balance and breadth, Mr. Amery drives home his case with convincing force and logic. There are few aspects of the Irish question on which he does not throw new light, and his lucid presentation of the difficulties and dangers of any scheme that means the overthrow of the Union is well worthy of careful study. Mr. Amery has in the past done yeoman service on behalf of the Irish Loyalists, and the publication of this pamphlet deepens their obligation to him. The volume is a substantial one, but is published at 3d. in order that it may reach the masses."

Northern Whig (Belfast.)

"The facts are presented in a way that facilitates reference, and altogether the publication makes an excellent armoury for those who are in need of weapons with which to fight on behalf of national unity."—*Standard.*

"An invaluable battery of arguments. . . . Puts the case for the union with cogency and clearness."

World.

Of all Booksellers **3d. net**; or post free from the Office, **4½d.**

THE WEST STRAND PUBLISHING COMPANY,
LTD.
10a King Street, Covent Garden, W.C.

MACMILLAN'S NEW BOOKS

Ruins of Desert Cathay.

Personal Narrative of Explorations in Central Asia and Westernmost China. By M. AUREL STEIN. With numerous Illustrations, Colour Plates, Panoramas, and Maps from Original Surveys. 2 vols. Royal 8vo. 42s. net.

A History of the Eastern Roman Empire from the Fall of Irene to the Accession of Basil I. (A.D. 802-867).

By J. B. BURY, Litt.D., Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge. 8vo. 12s. net.

By the Author of "Pro Christo et Ecclesiâ."

Voluntas Dei.

By the Author of "Pro Christo et Ecclesiâ." Crown 8vo. 5s. net.

The Athenæum.—"A comprehensive essay in Christian philosophy, treating of the relation of God's will to the world, to creation, autonomous life and purpose, and man's religious and moral life."

The Mafalu Mountain People of

British New Guinea. By ROBERT W. WILLIAMSON. With an Introduction by A. C. HADDON, Sc.D., F.R.S. With Illustrations and Map. 8vo. 14s. net.

Philistia and a Soul: A Wander

Book in Verse. By ALFRED ERNEST KNIGHT. Crown 8vo. 6s. net.

Common Land and Inclosure.

By E. C. K. GONNER, Professor of Economic Science in the University of Liverpool. With four Maps. 8vo. 12s. net.

The Daily News.—"An important book on an important subject . . . this most valuable book."

The Field.—"Mr. Gonner has given us one of the best books that have been published dealing with this intricate, delicate, and controversial question."

MACMILLAN & CO., LTD., LONDON.

The Military Danger of Home Rule in Ireland.

By Major-General Sir THOMAS FRASER, K.C.B.
Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. net.

EDEN PHILLPOTT'S New Novel.

The Forest on the Hill.

6s.

E. H. LACON WATSON'S New Novel.

The Family Living.

By the Author of "Barker's," &c. 6s.

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY.

THE "ARMY & NAVY CHRONICLE"

Established January 1900.

The only Illustrated Record of Monthly Events in the Army and Navy, the Territorial Forces, and the Naval Reserves, in existence.

PRICE SIXPENCE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS, which can commence with any number, 3/6 per annum post free. It can be ordered through any Newsagent, or will be sent direct from the Office if required.

A Specimen Copy, Scale of Charges for Advertisements, &c., will be sent on receipt of Eightpence-halfpenny, addressed to THE MANAGER, Offices of the ARMY & NAVY CHRONICLE (Department R.S.), 23 Waterloo Place, London, S.W.3.

SALES BY AUCTION.

THE LIBRARY OF LOUISA LADY ASHBURTON (deceased), removed from Melchet Court, near Romsey, Hampshire.

MESSRS. SOTHEBY, WILKINSON & HODGE will sell by AUCTION (by Order of the Executor, the Marquis of Northampton, K.G.), at their House, No. 13 Wellington Street, Strand, W.C., on MONDAY, April 15, and Four Following Days, at 1 o'clock precisely, the LIBRARY OF LOUISA LADY ASHBURTON (deceased), removed from Melchet Court, near Romsey, Hampshire, comprising Valuable Works on Natural History, including Audubon's Birds of North America, Atlas Folio, Wilson's American Ornithology, &c.; a Fine Series of Works by Thomas Carlyle, including many Presentation Copies with Autograph Inscriptions; an interesting Autograph Letter of Robert Browning; a Verse and Signature in the Autograph of Goethe; Works on Political Economy, Finance, &c.; Writings of Ruskin, Browning, Rossetti, &c.; Horæ Beatæ Mariæ Virginis, printed upon vellum, 1498, beautifully illuminated; &c. May be viewed. Catalogues may be had.

AUTOGRAPH LETTERS AND HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS.

MESSRS. SOTHEBY, WILKINSON & HODGE will sell by AUCTION, at their House, No. 13 Wellington Street, Strand, W.C., on MONDAY, April 22, at 1 o'clock precisely, VALUABLE AUTOGRAPH LETTERS AND HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS, the Property of a well-known COLLECTOR, including Letters of Queen Victoria, Napoleon III., Edward VII., and other Royalties; Letters of Literary and Artistic Celebrities of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries, including Edmund Burke, Robert Browning, G. Cruikshank, George Meredith, Sterne, R. L. Stevenson, Thackeray, and Horace Walpole; Naval and Military Letters and Papers, including a large and important Collection relating to the Duke of Wellington, and Letters of Clive, Nelson, &c.; a Fine and Apparently Unpublished Letter of Washington; a large number of Water-colour Drawings, by Paul Braddon, of the Homes and Haunts of Great Writers; and a Fine Copy of Forster's Life of Dickens, extended to Six Volumes by extra illustrations, including Pencil Drawings by F. Barnard, numerous Views and Portraits, and Autograph Letters of C. Dickens, Scott, Thackeray, Carlyle, T. Hood, Garrick, J. M. W. Turner, Tennyson, &c. May be viewed two days prior. Catalogues may be had.

Executors, Trustees, Solicitors, and Owners who may be desirous of selling Works of Art, Family Jewels, Old Silver, Furniture, Pictures, Prints, Miniatures, China, Coins, Books, Old Lace, Furs, Musical Instruments, Guns, and other Valuables, are informed that Messrs.

KNIGHT, FRANK & RUTLEY'S
SALE ROOMS, 20 HANOVER SQUARE, W.,
are Open Daily to receive goods intended for disposal.

Auctions of Estates and Town Properties and Sales on Owners' premises in all parts of the United Kingdom are held as required throughout the year. Large Funds available for Mortgages. Valuations for Estate and Legacy Duties. Farm Stock and Timber Sales. Management of Trust Estates and Receiverships undertaken.

R. ANDERSON & CO.,
BRITISH, INDIAN, AND COLONIAL ADVERTISEMENT
CONTRACTORS,

14 KING WILLIAM STREET, STRAND, W.C.,
GIVE THE BEST TERMS for Company and General Advertising. Advice, Estimates, and all information free of charge. Replies received.

**"What is in the BYSTANDER
this week?"**

is now the recognised salutation in
Political and Social circles.

Its handy size, its bright, topical
pictures, its pungent paragraphs all
combine to make THE BYSTANDER
the most popular paper of its class,
if, indeed, it may not be accurately
described as a class of itself.

Out every Wednesday. Price 6d.

OFFICES: TALLIS HOUSE, TALLIS STREET, LONDON, E.C.

**NOW ON SALE, THE APRIL
"BOOK MONTHLY"
PRICE 6d.**

CONTENTS.

PERSONAL AND PARTICULAR. The Round of the Clock in the World of Books.
"OH, TO BE POPULAR!" The Great British Public and the "Best-Selling" Novel—By CHARLES D. LESLIE.
▲ **PUBLISHING HOUSE.** The History of Harper and Brothers and Their Friends.
▲ **LONDON LETTER.** Sir Sidney Colvin Talks about R. L. Stevenson—By JAMES MILNE.
▲ **AT OMAR'S GRAVE.** The Tale of a Pilgrimage by A WANDERING SCHOLAR.
▲ **AUTHORS THREE!** Thomas Hardy, William Watson and Ernest Thompson Seton.
▲ **THE NECESSARY INGENUE.** Some Aspects of the Golden Girl Born for Novel-Heroes—By C. E. LAWRENCE.
▲ **NEW BOOKS NEARLY READY.** Particulars of Interesting Volumes Likely to be Published this Month.
▲ **BOOKS OF THE MONTH.** A Chronicle of the Noteworthy Publications of March with a Reviewing Commentary.
▲ **THE PERIODICALS.** Contents of some April Reviews and Magazines.
Illustrated Supplement: **BOOKS OF THE DAY IN PORTRAIT AND PICTURE.**
Publishers: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL & CO., Stationers' Hall Court, London.

MR. B. WENTWORTH VERNON, J.P., Chairman of the Ceylon Consolidated Rubber Estates, Ltd., says:—"Mr. William Wicherley, F.R.H.S., is one of the best-known authorities in the rubber world. I do not think that anybody living is a greater authority on rubber than he is. He has lately written a most interesting little book called 'The Whole Art of Rubber Growing,' and I strongly recommend it to all the shareholders, for they will find it very instructive and pleasant reading."

**THE
WHOLE ART OF RUBBER-GROWING**

By W. WICHERLEY, F.R.H.S.

Now Ready. 5s. net.

Mr. Wicherley is a practical planter, and his book is the result of wide experience in various lands. The book is fully illustrated, and is written in a way which makes it as great a pleasure to read as its hints are valuable. Its principal contents are:—

TREES THAT COUNT: Hevea Brasiliensis, Manihot Glaziovii, The New Manihots, The Ficus, Funtumia Elastica, and others.

INTERPLANTING, TAPPING SYSTEMS, COST OF PLANTING, HABITS OF TREES, &c., &c.

WITH A SPECIAL CHAPTER ON THE SOYA BEAN.

Copies may be ordered through any Bookseller, or direct from the office (5s. 4d. post free.)

THE WEST STRAND PUBLISHING CO., Ltd.,
10 King Street, Covent Garden, W.C.

"Nothing better could be wished for."—*British Weekly.*
"Far superior to ordinary guides."—*Daily Chronicle.*

DARLINGTON'S HANDBOOKS.

Visitors to London (and Residents) should use

DARLINGTON'S

"Very emphatically tops them all."—*Daily Graphic.*

LONDON

"A brilliant book."—*Times.*

"Particularly good."—*Academy.*

AND By E. C. COOK and
E. T. COOK, M.A.
ENVIRONS.

5th Edition Revised, 6s.
30 Maps and Plans.
80 Illustrations.

"The best handbook to London ever issued."—*Liverpool Daily Post.*

Illus. Maps and Plans, 5s.

100 Illus. Maps and Plans, 5s.

NORTH WALES.

DEVON AND CORNWALL.

50 Illustrations, 6 Maps, 2s. 6d.

NORTH DEVON AND NORTH CORNWALL.

50 Illustrations, 6 Maps, 2s. 6d.

SOUTH DEVON AND SOUTH CORNWALL.

1/-, THE HOTELS OF THE WORLD.

A Handbook to the Leading Hotels throughout the World.

Visitors to Edinburgh, Brighton, Eastbourne, Hastings, St. Leonards, Worthing, Bournemouth, Exeter, Torquay, Paignton, Exmouth, Sidmouth, Teignmouth, Dawlish, Plymouth, Dartmouth, Dartmoor, Exmoor, Falmouth, The Lizard, Penzance, Land's End, Scilly Isles, St. Ives, Newquay, Tintagel, Clovelly, Ilfracombe, Lynton, Minehead, Bideford, Wyse Valley, Severn Valley, Bath, Weston-super-Mare, Malvern, Hereford, Worcester, Gloucester, Cheltenham, Llandrindod, Brecon, Ross, Tintern, Llangollen, Aberystwyth, Towyn, Barmouth, Dolgelly, Harlech, Cricieth, Pwllheli, Llandudno, Rhyl, Conway, Colwyn Bay, Penmaenmawr, Llanfairfechan, Bangor, Carnarvon, Beddgelert, Snowdon, Festiniog, Trefriw, Bettws-y-Coed, Buxton, Matlock, The Peak, Norwich, Yarmouth, Lowestoft, Norfolk Broads, Isle of Wight, and Channel Islands should use

DARLINGTON'S HANDBOOKS, 1/- each.

Post free from Darlington & Co., Llangollen.

LLANGOLLEN: DARLINGTON & CO.

LONDON: SIMPKINS.

PARIS and NEW YORK BRENTANO'S.

The Railway Booklets & all Booksellers.

(Incorporated in the Transvaal.)

BALANCE SHEET, 31st DECEMBER, 1911.

CAPITAL AND LIABILITIES.

To Capital Account—		Shares of 5s. each as per Balance Sheet December 31, 1910		£490,000 0 0	
Authorized 1,960,000					
Add—	240,000	Shares of 5s. each created by Shareholders in Special General Meeting on June 19, 1911.		60,000	0 0
	2,200,000	Shares of 5s. each		£550,000	0 0
Less—	74,005	Shares of 5s. each in reserve...		18,501	5 0
Issued—	2,125,995	Shares of 5s. each		£531,498	15 0
	1,866,665	Made up as follows:— Shares of 5s. each as per Balance Sheet December 31, 1910		£460,666	5 0
	259,330	Shares of 5s. each issued during 1911		64,832	10 0
	2,125,995	Shares of 5s. each		£531,498	15 0
Share Premium Account—					
	Balance at December 31, 1910			£170,777	0 0
	Add premium on—				
	51,331 Shares issued at a premium of £7 19s. per Share			£403,948	7 0
	207,999 Shares issued at a premium of £7 19s. 6d. per Share			1,658,792	0 6
				2,061,740	7 6
	259,330 Shares.			2,232,517	7 6
	Less Amount written off the Assets acquired in exchange for the above 259,330 Shares			2,061,740	7 6
					170,777 0 0
Funds Transferred from Appropriation Account—					
	For expenditure on Investments in excess of Working Capital provided				3,113,347 6 5
					£3,815,623 1 5
Sundry Creditors—					
	Unpaid and unclaimed dividends			593,501	2 2
	Sundries			75,667	6 2
					669,168 8 2
Balance of Appropriation Account—					
	Unappropriated				682,642 16 9
					£5,167,434 6 4
PROPERTY AND ASSETS.					
Cn.					
By Claims, Mynpachts and Water Rights at cost—					
	1,356,755 Mining Claims and 10 Water Rights			£3,267	5 4
Freehold Farm Properties—					
	"Mooifontein No. 14," Freehold in extent 612 Morgen 137 Roods				
	"Langlaagte No. 13," Freehold in extent 236 Morgen 311 Roods 89 Feet			14,578	0 0
	"Driefontein No. 12," Freehold in extent 245 Morgen 434 Roods				
	Freehold and Leasehold House Properties			23,600	0 0
Reservoirs and Pumping Plants at cost—					
	Natal Spruit Reservoir and Pumping Plant			£121,016	0 5
	Booyse's Spruit Reservoir and Pumping Plant			51,796	0 6
				172,812	0 11
Shares and Debentures—					
	Shares of £1:				
	97,923 Modderfontein B. Gold Mines, Ltd.				
	Shares of £4:				
	22,670 New Modderfontein G. M. Co., Ltd.				
	Shares of £1:				
	47,500 Government Gold Mining Areas (Modderfontein) Consolidated, Ltd.				
	58,198 East Rand Proprietary Mines, Ltd.				
	269,224 Rose Deep, Ltd.				
	282,593 Goldenhuis Deep, Ltd.				
	215,558 Jupiter G. M. Co., Ltd.				
	387,583 Nourse Mines, Ltd.				
	192,437 City Deep, Ltd.				
	46,220 Wolhuter G. Mines, Ltd.				
	45,347 The Village Main Reef G. M. Co., Ltd.			3,534,529	15 8
	114,990 Village Deep, Ltd.				
	398,383 Ferreira Deep, Ltd.				
	Shares of 10s.				
	852,277 Crown Mines, Ltd.				
	Shares of £1:				
	39,782 Main Reef West, Ltd.				
	81,444 Bantjes Consolidated Mines, Ltd.				
	125,617 Durban Roodepoort Deep, Ltd.				
	12,000 Victoria Falls and Transvaal Power Co., Ltd. (6% Cumulative Pref. Shares)				
	5,222 Booyse's Estate, Ltd.				
	24,872 South Deep, Ltd.				
	4,230 Turfontein Estate, Ltd.				
	82,125 General Estates, Ltd.				
	5,758 Pretoria Portland Cement Co., Ltd.				
	Sundry Shares			615	1 0
	£33,960 East Rand Proprietary Mines, Ltd., 5 per cent. Debentures			33,280	18 6
				3,568,425	15 2

[illegible]

**PROFIT AND LOSS ACCOUNT FOR THE YEAR ENDING
31st DECEMBER, 1911.**

Dr.			
To Administration Expenses—			
Salaries and rents, Johannesburg and			
London	£9,584	17	0
Directors', Foreign Agents' and			
Auditors' fees	6,237	15	3
Stationery, printing, advertising,			
postages and telegrams	4,822	3	7
Legal expenses	201	15	4
Sundry general expenses	4,719	4	0
	£23,565	15	8
French Fiscal Taxes	5,018	19	11
Depreciation written off Real Estate, etc.	3,339	13	1
	£33,924		
Balance—			
Profit for the year carried to Appropriation Account			1,117,408
			£1,151,338
Cr.			
By Dividends on Shareholdings—			
New Modderfontein G.M. Co., Ltd.—23½ per cent.	£19,286	10	0
East Rand Proprietary Mines, Ltd.—30 per cent.	16,350	8	0
Rose Deep, Ltd.—40 per cent.	107,593	4	0
Geldenhuys Deep, Ltd.—30 per cent.	87,210	18	6
Nourse Mines, Ltd.—20 per cent.	76,546	12	0
Woluhur Gold Mines, Ltd.—15 per cent.	9,588	0	0
The Village Main Reef G.M. Co., Ltd.—70 per cent.			
Village Deep, Ltd.—10 per cent.	31,742	18	0
Ferreira Deep, Ltd.—45 per cent.	11,499	0	0
Crown Mines, Ltd.—110 per cent.	176,583	12	0
Main Reef West, Ltd.—17½ per cent.	466,744	8	6
Durban Roodepoort Deep, Ltd.—5 per cent.	6,007	17	0
General Estates, Ltd.—5 per cent.	9,189	5	6
Pretoria Portland Cement Co., Ltd.—55 per cent.	2,351	5	0
Sundry Shares	3,166	18	0
	150	0	0
	£1,025,273	16	1
Reservoirs—			
Net Revenue			25,434
Interest and Exchange			37,737
Sundry Revenue			3,166
Shares Realisation—			
Profit on Shares sold			59,700
			£1,151,338

APPROPRIATION ACCOUNT.

Dr.				
To Investment Account—				
Funds Appropriated for year ending				
31st December, 1911	£271,866	8 8
Dividend Account—				
Interim Dividend No. 16 of 110 per				
cent. declared 23rd June, 1911	...	£584,648	12 6	
Interim Dividend No. 17 of 110 per				
cent. declared 15th December, 1911	...	584,648	12 6	
			1,169,297	5 0
Balance unappropriated—				£1,441,163
Carried to Balance Sheet		682,642
				£2,123,806
Cr.				
By Balance unappropriated—				
As per Balance Sheet, 31st December, 1910	£1,006,397	14 1
Balance of Profit and Loss Account—				
For the Year ending 31st December, 1911	1,117,408	20 8
			£2,123,806	10 1

H. A. READ, } Joint Secretaries.
S. C. STEIL, }

RAYMOND W. SCHUMACHER, Chairman.
E. CHAPPELL, Director.

To the Shareholders of the Rand Mines, Ltd.

We report that we have examined the above Balance Sheet, with the Books, Accounts and Vouchers, in Johannesburg, for the year to 31st December, 1917, and with the Accounts received from London, and have obtained all the information and explanations we have required as Auditors. In our opinion such Balance Sheet is properly drawn up so as to exhibit a true and correct view of the state of the Company's affairs according to the best of our information and the explanations given to us, and as shown by the Books of the Company.

C. L. ANDERSSON & CO.,
Incorporated Accountants.
THOS. DOUGLAS,
Chartered Accountant. } Auditors.

Johannesburg,
5th March, 1912.

CONNOISSEURS OF COFFEE

DRINK THE
RED
WHITE
& BLUE

DELICIOUS FOR BREAKFAST & AFTER DINNER.

In making, use less quantity, it being much stronger than ordinary COFFEE.

POOLE & LORD,
INDIAN AND GENERAL OUTFITTERS,

322 OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.

(NEARLY OPPOSITE BOND STREET.)

INVENTORS OF THE

"Sans-Plis" SHIRT.

Prices from 7s. 6d.

The "SANS-PLIS" Shirt is superior to any other for Indian and Colonial wear. Being entirely free from gathers, it is cooler, much stronger, and will bear the Indian mode of washing better than any shirt in use.
A single shirt, or other article, made to measure, and accurate patterns preserved to ensure correctness in the execution of future orders.

Makers of Drawers with Flexible Hip Belt Bands.

"BREECHES CUT."

ELY CATHEDRAL.

Visitors will find First Class Hotel Accommodation at the "LAMB" Family Hotel, which is situated close to the Cathedral.
MODERATE TERMS. Omnibus meets all trains.

Proprietor, S. AIREY.

JAPAN WEEKLY CHRONICLE,

Published in Kobe every Thursday, and delivered in England by post, via Siberia, in 17 days. The *Japan Weekly Chronicle* consists of 42 pages, slightly larger than those of the *Saturday Review*, and is published at 25 sen per copy (6d.). Post free for 12 months, Yen 13 (26s.). Subscriptions and advertisements received at the London Office, 131 Fleet Street, E.C.

Dr. J. Collis Browne's
Chlorodyne

Insist on having
Dr. J. Collis Browne's
Chlorodyne
The ORIGINAL
and
ONLY GENUINE.

Purchasers should see that the name is on the stamp and emphatically refuse substitutes.

Universally acknowledged to be the
BEST and SUREST REMEDY for

COUGHS, COLDS,
ASTHMA, BRONCHITIS.

The only Palliative in Cuts short all attacks of
NEURALGIA, SPASMS, HYSTERIA,
GOUT, TOOTHACHE, and
RHEUMATISM. PALPITATION.

Acts like a Charm in
DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, and DYSENTERY.

Convincing Medical Testimony with each Bottle.

Of all Chemists, 1/3, 4/9, 4/6.

SCHWEPPE'S

"Profits exceed most sanguine expectations."

THE fifteenth annual ordinary general meeting of Schweppes, Ltd., was held on Thursday, Mr. C. D. Kemp-Welch, J.P., D.L., the Chairman and managing director, presiding.

The Secretary (Mr. W. McMillan) having read the notice convening the meeting and the report of the auditors,

The Chairman, having made a sympathetic reference to the loss of their late valued and respected secretary, Mr. Arthur, who died somewhat suddenly last summer, said: It is with great satisfaction that the directors once again meet the shareholders and are able to congratulate them on a splendid year's trading, and, not only that, but upon the largest net profits made since the formation of the company. When addressing you last year I told you that the directors had decided to write off the entire balance of the unusual expenditure incurred during the previous two years, and also the cost of the last Debenture issue, instead of carrying a portion forward. This rather drastic treatment enabled us to start 1911 with a clean slate, and, of course, this year we reap the benefit. Coronation year has come and gone, and with the assistance of a fine summer our work has been crowned with success, and our profits have exceeded our most sanguine expectations. As you remember, manufacturers were much inconvenienced for some weeks by the railway strike, and during its continuance we were unable to execute some very large orders, while for months after the termination of the strike our customers were unable to return their empty syphons, bottles, and cases. This, at so busy a time, caused us great inconvenience and loss, and besides that, an expenditure of nearly £20,000 in the purchase of new bottles, syphons, and cases, which would not have been necessary in ordinary times. Of course, this will lessen our expenditure on these items during the coming year, and it is shown in the balance sheet under consideration as an increase in the value of our stock and book debts as compared with the previous year. You will see by the accounts in your hands that the gross profits, after paying all expenses, including management charges, advertising, &c., and after making full allowance for depreciation, bad and doubtful debts, &c., amount to £101,728 12s. 7d., and the net profits, after paying Debenture stock interest, administration charges, &c., amount to £77,845 10s. 8d. Your directors considered that their first duty, after such a prosperous year, was to restore to the reserve account the £8,823 14s. 9d. taken from it last year, leaving, with the £3,836 17s. 10d. brought forward from last year, £72,858 13s. 9d. available for appropriation. This enables the directors to recommend the payment of the full dividends on the Preference and Ordinary shares and 5 per cent. on the Deferred, and carry forward £11,429 10s. 6d. As stated in the report, the directors consider it prudent to carry forward a substantial sum to meet any emergency that may arise during the forthcoming year. I am glad to report that the sales for the first three months of the present year are considerably larger than in the corresponding period last year. Competition continues to increase by the free importation of a large number of manufactured waters from over the seas, and I notice one company advertises that their filling during 1911 exceeded that of 1901 by some 10,000,000 bottles. Your company, whose products have been celebrated for over 130 years, can easily beat that, for our sales during the same period show an increase of 25,000,000 bottles, and so your company still holds, and intends to continue to hold, the premier position in the mineral water trade. (Hear, hear.) Your directors found it necessary to obtain larger premises in Scotland to meet the growing demand there, and have been fortunate in securing a property near Perth on most advantageous terms. On the estate is a very fine spring of water most suitable for our ordinary products, and, besides that, we came into possession of the celebrated Pelkeathy spring. These waters have a great reputation, especially among the medical profession in Scotland, who often recommend them for those suffering from gout and rheumatism. A systematic canvass is being made of all the leading medical men, and already many of those in London have been called upon and have expressed their gratification that these waters are to be exploited under the auspices of Schweppes, Ltd. During the past year or two we have experienced extensive imitations of our labels that protect our products, the most serious ones being in Egypt, where our waters have a very large sale. It is, of course, imperative to take action immediately these frauds are discovered, and the directors are glad to inform you that they have secured judgments in our favour in both the prosecutions in Egypt. One case was considered so gross that we were awarded £600 damages. We have two other actions pending in South America, and are determined to protect the public by prosecuting any firm attempting frauds of this nature. I now have pleasure in moving the adoption of the directors' reports and accounts for the year ended 31 December 1911, and the payment of the dividends recommended.

Mr. Walter H. Harris, O.M.G., seconded the motion.

Mr. W. N. Hibbert congratulated the Chairman and directors upon the nature of the balance sheet presented. He hoped that in future accounts more detailed particulars would be given. The item of directors' fees, £900, represented a very small amount for the directors to receive, and he thought that other items might also be shown in such detail as would enable the shareholders to do full justice to them. The amount paid as fees to the trustees for the Debenture stockholders appeared to him to be large for the work which they had to do.

The Chairman said that Mr. Hibbert's suggestions would have the consideration of the directors. The board had no power to alter the fees payable to the trustees for the Debenture stockholders, but no doubt the point would be brought before the trustees by the directors.

Mr. W. H. Skeel said that the fees in question were fixed under the Debenture trust deed, and he did not think it could be said that it was the feeling of the meeting that they were too high.

The Chairman said that at all events it might be taken as the view of some of the shareholders.

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

The Chairman then proposed the re-election of the retiring director, Sir Ernest Clarke.

Sir William P. Treloar, Bart., who seconded the motion, emphasised the Chairman's statement that as a result of the railway strike £20,000 had been expended by the company upon the provision of extra cases, syphons, and bottles, a fact which showed what an immense business the company carried on.

The resolution was unanimously adopted, and Sir Ernest Clarke briefly returned thanks.

The auditors, Messrs. James and Edwards, were reappointed, and on the motion of Mr. G. H. Dudman, seconded by Mr. O. E. Nuthall, a vote of thanks to the Chairman, directors, and staff, concluded the proceedings.

FOOTPRINTS of FAMOUS AMERICANS in PARIS

By JOHN JOSEPH CONWAY
With an Introduction by Mrs. JOHN LANE
Many Illustrations
12s. 6d. net
Ready immediately

FOUNDATIONS of the NINETEENTH CENTURY

By HOUSTON STEWART CHAMBERLAIN
Translated by Dr. JOHN LEES
With an Introduction by LORD REDESDALE
2 Vols. 25s. net
Second Edition

**MARGARET of FRANCE DUCHESS of SAVOY
1523-1577**

By WINIFRED STEPHENS
Seventeen Illustrations
12s. 6d. net

RECOLLECTIONS of A COURT PAINTER

By H. JONES THADDEUS, R.H.A., F.R.G.S., ETC.
Handsomely Illustrated by the Author's Pictures
12s. 6d. net

THE JOURNAL of A SPORTING NOMAD

By J. T. STUDLEY
Many Illustrations
12s. 6d. net

**THE BETTS of WORTHAM in SUFFOLK
1480-1905**

By KATHARINE FRANCES DOUGHTY
12s. 6d. net

BEAUTY AND UGLINESS

By VERNON LEE & C. ANSTRUTHER THOMSON
Many Illustrations
12s. 6d. net

EGYPT & OTHER POEMS

By FRANCIS COUTTS
3s. 6d. net

**A TRAGEDY IN STONE
And Other Papers**

By LORD REDESDALE, G.C.V.O., K.C.B., ETC.
7s. 6d. net

**THE ANARCHISTS
Their Faith and Their Record**

By ERNEST A. VIZETELLY
Many Illustrations
10s. 6d. net

ABOUT ALGERIA

By C. THOMAS-STANFORD, F.S.A.
32 Illustrations and Map
By F. DORRIEN THOROTON
5s. net

JUNGLE FOLK

By DOUGLAS DEWAR
Indian Natural History Sketches
10s. 6d. net

THESE BOOKS ARE PUBLISHED BY JOHN LANE,
LONDON AND NEW YORK